THE PAULINE FORMULA
"INDUERE CHRISTUM"

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE WORKS OF

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

JUL 9 1921

H.C.L.

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the Sacred Sciences at the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Doctorate in Theology

---

BY

THE REVEREND LEO JOSEPH OHLEYER, O. F. M., S.T. L.
OF THE PROVINCE OF THE SACRED HEART
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1921

3781
C360
UNCLASSED
Dissertation

THE PAULINE FORMULA
"INDUERE CHRISTUM"

WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE WORKS OF

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the Sacred Sciences at the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Doctorate in Theology

---

BY

THE REVEREND LEO JOSEPH OHLEYER, O. F. M., S.T. L.
OF THE PROVINCE OF THE SACRED HEART
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON, D. C.
1921

Nihil obstat,
Faustinus Hack, O.F.M.
Censor deputatus.

Imprimi permittitur,
Samuel Macke, O.F.M.
Minister Provincialis.

Nihil obstat,
P. L. Biermann
Censor deputatus.

Imprimatur,
Georgius Gulielmus Mundelein
Archiepiscopus Chicagiensis.

Universitas Catholica Americae

Washingtonii, D. C.

S. Facultas Theologica, 1920-1921

No. 17

PREFACE

St. Paul, as is well known, originated a number of typical phrases, aptly styled formulas, by which to express concisely and comprehensively the great truths of the Christian religion. These set forms of speech occur most frequently in connection with the Apostle's Christological teachings. Some of the Pauline formulas have received exhaustive treatment at the hands of scholars of note. Deissmann's study Ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ and Heitmüller's work *Im Namen Jesu* are only two of many instances. One of the most striking and important of these formulas, which has not yet found a solution, is "Induere Christum." The present treatise is an attempt at a solution.

The author wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness and to express his sincere gratitude to the Rev. Dr. Heinrich Schumacher, Professor of New Testament Exegesis at the Catholic University, with whose aid and under whose direction this monograph has been written. Acknowledgments are due also to the Rev. Ferdinand Gruen, O. F. M., for his services in revising the manuscript and preparing it for the press.

Leo J. Ohleyer, O. F. M.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Introduction 7

CHAPTER

I. History of the Interpretation of "Induere Christum" in the Middle Ages and in Modern Times 3

II. Interpretation of "Induere Christum" according to St. John Chrysostom 33

III. Historico-Literary Investigation of (Ἐν)δύειν-(Ἐν)δύεσθαι 53

IV. Application of the Results to Rom. XIII, 14 and Gal. III, 27 98

Corollary. Confirmation of the Results by the Meaning of the Formula Βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ 101

Bibliography 103

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/paulineformulain0000stjo

INTRODUCTION

The much disputed expression "induere Christum" is one of the most important and interesting of the N. T. formulas. It receives its chief importance from its connection with Baptism and regeneration. This phrase was chosen by St. Paul (Gal. III, 27) to express the grand truth of man's palingenesis, which is the incomparable and transcendent realization of the cherished hopes and ardent cravings of the ancient peoples, Jewish and Gentile, for a σωτηρία from the slavery of sin and satan and for a renewal of themselves and a closer union with God. Again, "induere Christum" is used by St. Paul without any reference to Baptism, in an ethical sense. In Rom. XIII, 14, is contained an epitome of the principles of moral perfection. It is evident from these contexts alone, which concern the most vital truths of Christianity, that our formula presents a paramount and pivotal problem of N. T. exegesis.

But this phrase has received an astounding variety of interpretations; and, what is worse, as time proceeds, the views concerning the meaning of the expression become more and more divergent and confusing, culminating in the findings of the comparative study of religions. Both the extraordinary importance of the words and the utter confusion concerning their meaning, therefore, recommend this famous N. T. formula to a special study and a thorough investigation.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF "INDUERE CHRISTUM" IN THE MIDDLE AGES AND IN MODERN TIMES

For the investigation of the Pauline formula "induere Christum" a history of its interpretation in the Middle Ages and in modern times will be of great advantage and importance. Such a historical review will not only clearly set forth the problem involved and the status of opinion bearing on it, but also suggest methods of arriving at a correct solution. Since the number of commentaries on Rom. XIII, 14, and Gal. III, 27, is very great, and since many interpreters give identical explanations, it is both impossible and unnecessary to quote or to mention them all. We shall cite as many authors as is necessary to obtain a comprehensive view of the state of the question. For the sake of clearness and brevity we shall group them in classes, according to their explanations of the origin of the Pauline formula.

I. "Induere Christum": A Metaphor Derived from the Idea of Putting on a Garment

Exegetes are quite generally agreed that the phrase "induere Christum" is to be taken, not in a literal, but in a figurative sense; and that it stands in some relation to the idea of putting on a garment. Some commentators, who think that the metaphor is immediately derived from the expression "induere vestem" (*ἐνδύεσθαι ἱμάτιον*), inquire no further into its origin, but base their interpretation of Gal. III, 27, and Rom. XIII, 14, solely on the analogies they find by considering Christ as our garment. Opinions vary, however, as to the fundamental idea contained in this comparison.

1. Union.—To put on Christ as a garment, according to some authors, means to enter into intimate union with Him. Beet ex-

plains the ground of this analogy when he says that "clothes are something distinct from us; which, when put on, become almost a part of ourselves." Applying this explanation to Rom. XIII, 14, he says God presents to us the image of His Son and "bids us enter into a union with Him so close that Christ becomes the element in which we live and move."[1] For similar reasons, Farrar describes Christ "as a close-fitting robe" to be put on by "close spiritual communion."[2]

2. Imitation.—Shook remarks, in reference to Rom. XIII, 14, that the putting on of Christ as a garment implies an intimate spiritual relation with Him, which is effected "by shaping our character by his," or by imbibing "Christ's spirit to the extent that the 'ego' is completely covered up, as far as possible."[3] According to Horace Bushnell, the ground of the comparison consists in this, that "dress relates to the form or figure of the body, character to the form or figure of the soul"; that, in fact, character "is the dress of the soul." This similarity in relations, he asserts, is the reason why character is so often represented in Holy Scripture as the dress of the soul. Since "character is the soul's dress, and dress analogical to character," he concludes that "whatever has power to produce a character when received is represented as a dress to be put on." In this manner, he continues, Paul regards Christ as "the soul's new dress" or "new character" when he exhorts the Romans to put Him on. "Christ," he explains, "is to be a complete wardrobe for us himself, and that by simply receiving his person we are to have the holy texture of his life upon us, and live in the unfolding of his character."[4]

3. Profession of Discipleship.—The phrase "induere Christum" in Gal. III, 27, where it occurs in connection with Baptism, is interpreted by Matthew Henry to mean to "put on his livery" and declare ourselves "to be his servants and disciples." By putting on Christ in Baptism, he adds, "we profess our discipleship to him and are obliged to behave ourselves as his faithful servants."[5] Already in the middle of the sixteenth century, Musculus interpreted the words "Christum induistis," in Gal. III, 27, to mean to be dedicated and consecrated to Christ. After stating

[1] *Comm. on Rom.*, 347.
[2] *Life and Work of St. Paul*, II, 263.
[3] *Comm. and Lex. on N. T.*, 325.
[4] *Bible Readers' Comm.*, II, 265.
[5] *Exposition of O. and N. T.*, IX, 301.

that "induimini Christum," in Rom. XIII, 14, expresses an exhortation to "vivere, ambulare ac conversare secundum spiritum et vitam Christi," he adds that, in Gal. III, 27, St. Paul reminds the Galatians that, when they were baptized, they put on not Moses but Christ—"non Mosi, sed Christo esse initiatos ac consecratos: ideoque vivendum ipsis esse non sub paedagogia Mosis sed sub gratia, spiritu, fide ac professione Christi." He further says that, like Moses, Christ has a distinctive garb, which His followers must wear. The robe of Moses is the Law; the garment of Christ is especially His grace, His justice, and His spirit. He concludes with the remark that the baptized person puts on Christ "dum in gratiam illius, justitiam et praerogativam inseritur, ac per spiritum illius regeneratur."[6]

4. Covering and Protection.—The analogy between Christ and a garment that is put on, according to some authors, implies the idea that Christ is our covering and protection. Guyse says that the baptized "are, as it were, all covered with Christ, as a man is covered with his garments."[7] He gives the same interpretation of Rom. XIII, 14: "See that ye be all over covered with Christ, as with a garment, and be found in him."[8] According to Locke, Christ so covers the Christians that "to God now looking upon them there appears nothing but Christ."[9] Already Calvin had said that Paul by the "metaphor of a garment" wished to express the close union of the faithful with Christ, so that "in the presence of God, they bear the name and character of Christ, and are viewed in him rather than in themselves."[10] Pool says, in reference to Rom. XIII, 14, that it is "Christ and his righteousness only that can cover us (as a garment doth our nakedness) in the sight of God."[11] According to Hofmann, the command to put on Christ was given in contrast to the moral nakedness of the natural man, "im Gegensatze gegen die sittliche Blösse des natürlichen Menschen;"[12] whereas long before him St. Bruno had seen in the words of Paul a reference to the naked state of man's soul in consequence of original and personal sin. He observes, relatively

[6] *Comm. ad Gal. et Eph.*, 125-126.
[7] *Practical Expositor*, III, 335.
[8] *Op. cit.*, III, 541.
[9] Quoted from Belsham, *Ep. of Paul*, III, 72. The original could not be obtained.
[10] *Comm. on Gal. and Eph.*, 110.
[11] *Annotations on H. Bible*, 526.
[12] *Heilige Schrift N. T.*, III, 547.

to Gal. III, 27, that man, who by sin became naked and suffered want and ignominy, puts on Christ "et ad tegendam nuditatem suam et ad gloriam."[13] More clearly does he refer to Adam's sin when he interprets St. Paul's exhortation to the Romans as a command to clothe their nakedness with the faith of Christ and the other virtues that follow on faith: "Homo, enim, propter peccatum de paradiso nudus ejectus est; sed nuditas ista velari debet ornamento fidei caeterarumque virtutum."[14]

Guyse and Macknight stress the point that Christ covers us completely. Guyse, as we have observed, remarks that we are, "as it were, *all* covered with Christ, as a man is with his garment."[15] Macknight asserts that "to put on as a garment this or that quality . . . signifies to acquire great plenty of the thing said to be put on."[16] But long before these men, Ven. Herveus explained St. Paul's exhortation "Christum induimini" as meaning: "Formam Christi sumite vestem, ut habitus et forma illius *undique* fulgeat, et repraesentetur in nobis."[17]

The idea of covering suggests, if it does not necessarily include, that of protection. In fact, both ideas may be harmonized in so far as this covering is at the same time decorative and protective. Walafridus Strabo,[18] Peter Lombard,[19] and other medieval writers, in explanation of Gal. III, 27, quote the words: "Christum induistis, id est, conformes ei facti estis, quod est vobis honor, et contra aestus protectio."

The idea of covering and protection is clearly set forth by St. Thomas: "Qui induitur aliqua veste, protegitur ac contegitur ea, et apparet sub colore vestis colore proprio occultato. Eodem modo et qui induit Christum, protegitur et contegitur a Christo Jesu, contra impugnationes et aestus, et in eo nihil aliud apparet nisi qui Christi sunt."[20]

Corol. 1. "Induere Christum" means to put on Christ as our armor.—Beet[21] regards the words "put on the Lord Jesus Christ," in Rom. XIII, 14, as "parallel" with the expression contained in v. 12: "Let us . . . put on the armour of light." To the exposi-

[13] *Opera*, II, 217.
[14] *Op. cit.*, II, 73.
[15] *Op. cit.*, III, 335.
[16] *Apostolic Ep.*, 393.
[17] Migne, *P. L.*, 181, 782 A.
[18] Migne, *P. L.*, 114, 577 D.
[19] Migne, *P. L.*, 192, 133 A.
[20] *In Omnes Pauli Ep. Comm.*, 142 D.
[21] *Comm. on Rom.*, 347.

tion of Rom. XIII, 14, given above, he adds: "Since union with Christ makes us safe, and gives us power to do God's work, to put on Christ is to arm ourselves for the fight." According to Whedon, St. Paul exhorts the Romans to let Christ "be buckled on" to their "body and soul as an armour," and to put Him on "instead of wanton attire."[22] Moule explains how we are to put on Christ as our armor: "It is by the 'committal of the keeping of our souls unto Him,' not vaguely, but definitely and with purpose, in view of each and every temptation."[23]

Zahn[24] objects that, although St. Paul's term reminds us of his words in v. 12, yet "wird . . . Christus schwerlich dadurch als die Waffenrüstung der Christen bezeichnet sein sollen." The foregoing explanation, he continues, could not be applied to Gal. III, 27, and Eph. IV, 24, and Col. III, 10. Moreover, the passages, in which the Apostle describes the armor of the Christians, militate against the proposed interpretation. On the contrary, he says, the picture of the "notwendigen Rüstung für den Kampf" is superseded by that of the "wohlanständigen Wandels."

Corol. 2. Christ as the "covering" for our sins.—The interpretation that Christ is as a garment covering us, has, on the other hand, been advanced as a proof of the Protestant doctrine concerning the outward imputation of the justice of Christ. "Induere Christum," according to Melanchton, means, in the first place, that the sinner with the arm of faith seizes Christ as his Savior and acknowledges Him as the covering whereby we are shielded against God's wrath.[25] In Baptism, he says, in another place, we have put on Christ "scl. imputata nobis ipsius justicia."[26]

Catholics maintain that the metaphor gives no countenance to this theory. Belsham calls it a "notion than which nothing can be more foreign to the Apostle's mind, or more inconsistent with reason and with Christianity."[27] Cornely also warns against this interpretation. After quoting the words of St. Thomas given above, he adds that we must be careful not to understand St. Paul's figure "de mera quadam apparentia vel externa imputatione; per baptismum quippe," he continues, "homo regeneratur," since through Baptism the new man is born, the Christian be-

[22] *Comm. on N. T.*, III, 384.
[23] *Ep. to the Rom.*, 368.
[24] *Brief an d. Röm.*, 567.
[25] *Opera*, XV, 719.
[26] *Op. cit.*, XV, 1024.
[27] *Ep. of Paul*, III, 72.

comes a member of the mystical body of Christ, is informed by His Spirit and is perfectly conformed to Him.[28]

Burkitt contends the idea of a garment does not adequately express the change wrought in us when we "put on Christ" in Baptism. "To put on Christ," he observes, "is not as to put on a Suit of Cloaths fitted to the body, but as Metal cast into a Mould, receiving the figure from it."[29] Cornely and Schaefer, however, reject this view. According to Schaefer, clothes give a new form and at the same time fit the figure of the person who wears them. "So," he continues, "besteht der Getaufte in seiner Persönlichkeit fort, tritt aber mit dem lebendigen Christus in eine mystische Vereinigung ein."[30]

A decidedly better way to find the solution of our problem, is to seek, as many commentators have done, to establish the philological origin of St. Paul's formula.

II. The Metaphor "Induere Christum," a Hebrew Original

Vorstius[31] and others insist that St. Paul borrowed this figure from the Hebrew tongue. Ἐνδύεσθαι, they maintain, is the equivalent for לבשׁ, which, in its literal sense, means "to clothe." Stock[32] asserts that Vorstius has clearly proved that the metaphorical signification was given to ἐνδύεσθαι by the N. T. writers after the example of the Hebrew equivalent. Stephanus,[33] Cornelius a Lapide,[34] and Alexander Natalis[35] simply regard this phrase as a Hebraism. Cremer remarks "die Prof.-Gräc. kennt diese Ausdrucksweise nicht ausser dem homerischen ἐπιέννυναι ἄλκην, ἀναιδείην, Il. 20, 381; 1, 149. Sie ist wesentlich semitisch."[36] Gesenius[37] adduces various instances of the metaphorical use of שׁבל and the corresponding words in Aramaic and Syriac; while Schoettgen,[38] to buttress his contention that St. Paul, in Rom. XIII, 14, is speaking "de anima sane vestienda," quotes several cabalistic interpretations of rabbis, in which they speak of clothing man's soul.

[28] *Comm. in II Cor. et Gal.*, 517.
[29] *Expository Notes on N. T.* (no pages marked).
[30] *Briefe an d. Thess. u. an d. Gal.*, 302.
[31] *De Hebraismis N. T.*, 126.
[32] *Clavis N. T.*, 336.
[33] *N. T. Graec. et Lat.*, 215.
[34] *Comm. in Scrip. S.*, XVIII, 226.
[35] *Comm. in Omnes Ep.*, 205.
[36] *Bib.-theol. Wörterbuch d. neut. Gräc.*, 377.
[37] *Thesaurus Phil. Crit.*, II, 742.
[38] *Horae Heb. et Tal.*, 571.

Yet when the authors, who think "induere Christum" is a metaphorical locution borrowed from the Hebrew language, wish to determine the precise meaning of the original Hebrew and the fundamental idea underlying the metaphor, they differ not a little.

1. "INDUERE" = UNION.—Borger,[39] who is quoted also by Bloomfield,[40] opines that the Hebrew equivalent for "induere" is used "de quavis conjunctione arctiore." Accordingly, he interprets Gal. III, 27, as meaning "arctissimo cum Christo vinculo estis conjuncti." De Wette[41] regards the phrase as a "Bild der innigsten Geistesgemeinschaft mit Chr." He adds that the word לבשׁ was used in a similar sense by the Hebrews.

2. "INDUERE" = ABUNDANCE.—According to Tholuck,[42] "לבשׁ in a figurative sense, means to be wholly filled with anything." Accordingly, he states that Paul in Rom. XIII, 14, "exhorts to a close union of the soul with Christ." Stuart, after interpreting "induimini Christum," in Rom. XIII, 14, in the sense of "imitate," adds that "perhaps it here means like the Hebrew לבשׁ, to be filled with, and so the idea is: Be filled with a Christian spirit, abound in it; 'let Christ dwell in you richly.'"[43]

3. "INDUERE" = ADOPTION.—Thus Ellicott explains ἐνδύεσθαι, which is used in the LXX for the Hebrew לבשׁ. In this sense, too, he interprets Gal. III, 27. "The Christian, at his baptism, 'took to himself' Christ, and sought to grow into full unison and union with Him."[44]

4. "INDUERE" = ASSUMPTION OF QUALITIES.—Preuschen[45] remarks that in the N. T. ἐνδύεσθαι, like לבשׁ, is very frequently used metaphorically to signify the "Annahme v. Eigenschaften, Tugenden, Gesinnungen u.a." "Induere Christum" he takes to mean "sich d. Geist Chr. wie e. Gewand umlegen." In a similar way, Wieseler[46] notes that the figure of a garment is frequently used in the O. T. in regard to "Eigenschaften, Zuständen und Stimmungen der Seele." In the same meaning, he says, is the phrase "to

[39] *Interpr. Ep. ad Gal.*, 246.
[40] *Recensio synop. Annot. Sacr.*, VII, 406.
[41] *Erklärung d. Briefes an d. Röm.*, 177.
[42] *Exposition of Rom.*, 399.
[43] *Comm. on Rom.*, 406.
[44] *N. T. Comm.*, II, 448.
[45] *Griech.-deutsch. Handwörterbuch z. N. T.*, 387-388.
[46] *Comm. über d. Gal.*, 318-320.

put on a person" used in the N. T., by which "nicht zunächst der äussere habitus und Wandel, sondern vor Allem die bis in den Grund gehende Umbildung und Verähnlichung gemeint wird." Accordingly, he explains Gal. III, 27, as meaning "sein Bild," *i.e.*, that of the heavenly and perfect man, "in sich aufnehmen und in sich ausgestalten." With this explanation, he contends, also Rom. XIII, 14, harmonizes very well. Here the Roman Christians are exhorted to put on the Lord Jesus, *i.e.*, "nach dem V. 13 erwähnten Gegensatze, des Herrn Jesu Bild durch einen sittlichen Wandel in sich auszugestalten."

5. "Induere" = Acquisition of Anything whereby we are honored or dishonored.—Stephanus[47] remarks that לבשׁ is used "in re quavis cujus accessione vel ornamur . . . vel dedecoramur." He adds, however, that the "peculiaris energia" of the Pauline formula in Gal. III, 27, seems to be "quod in possessionem Christi mittamur, ita ut ille sit in nobis et nos in illo." By way of example he refers to Judg. VI, 34, where we read: "Spiritus autem Domini induit Gedeon." In Rom. XIII, 14, Stephanus thinks that the Apostle refers to the "fructus sanctificationis . . . a Christi Spiritu exorientes," with which we are to adorn ourselves.

A more exhaustive exposition of the figurative meaning of לשׁב is given by Cornelius a Lapide. He declares that the Hebrew word לבשׁ is used to express that some one is clothed with "pudore, decore, salute, justitia, maledictione, id est, his repleri, copiose decorari, vel dedecorari." "Indumentum," therefore, signifies "copiam undique circumfusam."[48] In Canon XXXVII, he explains the nature of the metaphor. At times, he says, St. Paul mentions the "rem . . . pro adjacentibus rei." Thus, for instance, Christ is called faith, grace, and Baptism. Among other examples that serve to illustrate this way of speaking, he adduces that of "induere Christum." By this figure, St. Paul means to say that the baptized put on "Christi virtutes, spiritum et mores."[49] In agreement with the foregoing explanation of the figurative meaning of "induere" in general and of "induere Christum" in particular is his interpretation of Gal. III, 27, and Rom. XIII, 14. The Galatians, he explains, have received in Baptism the "copiam

[47] *N. T. Graec. et Lat.*, 78.
[48] *Comm. in Scrip. S.*, XVIII, 226.
[49] *Op. cit.*, XVIII, 29.

Christi gratiam, dona, virtutes," which surround and cover them like a garment, so that they become "consortes divinae naturae et filiationis, ac consequenter divinarum operationum," by which Christ should shine in them.[50] And the exhortation in Rom. XIII, 14, means: Put on the Lord Jesus Christ, so that "Jesu spiritus, gratia, virtus, vita, in vobis eluceant."[51]

6. "Induere" Expresses Condition in Contrast to Conduct.—Cremer[52] contends that, whenever Paul uses ἐνδύεσθαι metaphorically, a condition (Zustand) is meant and not conduct (Verhalten). St. Paul's exhortation to put on Christ "läuft nicht auf ein Verhalten wie das Verhalten Jesu hinaus," and his statement in Gal. III, 27, "besagt nichts weniger, als dass die Getauften erscheinen, als wären sie Christus oder Abbilder Christi." Here Christ is to be considered "nicht nach seinem Verhalten, seinem Wandel, sondern nach seiner Heilsbedeutung." After observing that the words Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε in Gal. III, 27, must be interpreted in accordance with the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ εἶναι, he continues: "Wer getauft ist, hat Christum angezogen, ist des Heiles teilhaftig." If Rom. XIII, 14, is to be interpreted consistently with the foregoing explanation, it must mean that the Romans "durch den gläubigen Zusammenschluss mit dem Herrn des Heiles sich in den Stand setzen sollen," to fulfill the exhortation contained in the second half of the same verse.

III. The Metaphor "Induere Christum" a Greek Original

Another class of commentators hold that the Apostle's figure is Greek in origin. They point to the fact that the Greek writers use ἐνδύεσθαι with a personal object, which is exactly the use St. Paul makes of the word. Commentators conclude, therefore, that the inspired writer was not the originator of this figurative locution in Greek, and that he did not borrow the expression from the Hebrew, but that he merely used a metaphor already in vogue among the Greeks. The opinions of exegetes, however, concerning the precise meaning of the current Greek phrase ἐνδύεσθαί τινα, and consequently of the Pauline formula ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν again vary greatly. The following list will give an idea of the obscurity and confusion concerning the fundamental concept contained in these figures of speech.

[50] *Op. cit.*, XVIII, 547.
[51] *Op. cit.*, XVIII, 226.
[52] *Bib.-theol. Wörterbuch d. neut. Gräc.*, 378.

1. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ = Imitation in General.—Tholuck[53] ventures the opinion that *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα* "directly signifies, even in Greek, to imitate anyone"; while Stuart[54] less boldly asserts that to imitate "is the usual sense" of the Greek figure. Olshausen[55] observes that "profane writers also use *ἀποδύεσθαι* and *ἐνδύεσθαι* . . . in the sense of fashioning one's self unlike or like a person." Evidently he speaks by way of illustration or confirmation of the meaning of "induere Christum" in Rom. XIII, 14. Stuart,[56] on the other hand, is not certain whether "induere Christum" means "to imitate" or "to be filled with a Christian spirit"; whereas Tholuck,[57] as we remarked above, even thinks it is "more probable" that St. Paul used the figure after the Hebrew.

2. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ = External Imitation.—According to Bloomfield,[58] the examples of *ἐνδύεσθαι* and *ἀποδύεσθαι*, which have been cited by commentators in illustration of St. Paul's formula, contain "no more than a slight allusion to conduct considered figuratively as a dress." The exhortation, "put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. XIII, 14) he, accordingly, interprets: "Take upon you his manners, follow his example." Similarly Wieseler says that the expression *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*, as used by profane writers, signifies, "Jemand nachahmen, seinen habitus annehmen, aber mehr in äusserlicher, sinnfälliger Weise, 'agere personam alicujus.'"[59] It must be observed that he does not regard this expression as the origin of St. Paul's phrase. According to Zahn,[60] *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα* means "sich in die Rolle eines anderen hineindenken und darnach handeln, sich wie ein anderer geberden und darstellen." He remarks that St. Paul is wont to employ the verb *ἐνδύεσθαι* probably not without reference to this use of *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*, "aber doch mit lebendiger Vergegenwärtigung der sinnlichen Anschauung, welche der bildliche Ausdruck bietet." This explanation he applies to Gal. III, 27. Here, he says, St. Paul views Christ as a garment, "welches alle Getauften wie einen einzigen Körper . . . umhüllt, oder, sofern sie als Individuen betrachtet werden, alle gleich gekleidet erscheinen lässt."[61] Likewise, in his exposition of

[53] *Exposition of Rom.*, 414.
[54] *Comm. on Rom.*, 406.
[55] *Bib. Comm. on Rom.*, 404.
[56] *Op. cit.*, 406.
[57] *Op. cit.*, 414.
[58] *Recensio synop. Annot. Sacr.*, VI, 161.
[59] *Op. cit.*, 320.
[60] *Brief an d. Gal.*, 186.
[61] *Ibid.*

Rom. XIII, 14, he regards Christ as the garment which should cover the nakedness of the Christians, and in which they can appear before men and God.[62]

D'Outrein asserts that the external imitation expressed by ἐνδύεσθαί τινα may be either apparent or real. In the theaters, he explains, the actors are said to put on the person whom they represent. In consequence of this imitation in dress, action, and speech, the audience seem to hear and see the very person who is represented. "Atque illud quidem fit simulanter," he continues. "Verum et judicis aliusve personam induere dicitur, qui vere judex est ipse, judiciumque exercet, sive scil. ipsius loco, sive vice alterius."[63] Like D'Outrein, also, Kypke[64] and Rosenmüller[65] say this expression was used of stage players and means to "seek to imitate and represent the actions" of another. In the light of this explanation, they interpret Rom. XIII, 14: "Imitamini Christum, similes illi fieri studete."[66] Concerning the interpretation of Gal. III, 27, however, they are at variance. Kypke[67] retains the same explanation as in Rom. XIII, 14, and interprets the Apostle's words as expressing similarity to Christ. Rosenmüller, on the contrary, understands the Pauline formula, as it occurs in Gal. III, 27, in the sense of union. Whoever receives Baptism, he explains, "conjungitur cum Christo, adipiscitur jura et commoda Christi sectatoribus propria."[68]

3. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ = Imitation of Mind and Sentiments.—So Wahl[69] says of ἐνδύεσθαί τινα, "*i. e.*, indolem, mentem, sensum alicujus sumere." By way of illustration he refers to Gal. III, 27, and Rom. XIII, 14. Also Preuschen[70] regards ἐνδύεσθαι in general (like לבשׁ) as a metaphor, which denotes the "Annahme v. Eigenschaften, Tugenden, Gesinnungen u.a." D'Outrein[71] observes that the subject of the "induere" receives "similes affectus, virtutes sive vitia," as the personal object, which is to be regarded as the exemplar of the former. He makes no special application, however, of this explanation either to Gal. III, 27, or Rom. XIII, 14.

[62] *Brief an d. Röm.*, 567.
[63] *Spicilegium*, 364.
[64] *Observ. Sacr.*, II, 186.
[65] *Scholia in N. T.*, III, 759.
[66] *Ibid.*
[67] *Op. cit.*, II, 186.
[68] *Op. cit.*, IV, 480.
[69] *Clavis N. T.*, 541.
[70] *Griech.-deutsch. Handwörterbuch z. N. T.*, 387-388.
[71] *Op. cit.*, 365.

4. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ = Internal and External Imitation. —Meyer,[72] whom Lange[73] cites in confirmation of his exposition of Rom. XIII, 14, remarks that also with the Greeks the expression *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα* signifies "jemandes Sinnes-u. Handlungsweise annehmen." Bern. Weiss[74] and Luthhardt[75] give precisely the same explanation. According to these authors, however, *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* implies more than the current Greek phrase *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*. It signifies not merely imitation but primarily union, by which imitation is effected; or, as Meyer says with regard to Rom. XIII, 14: "Vereiniget euch zur innigsten Lebensgemeinschaft mit Christo, so dass ihr ganz Christi Sinn und Leben in eurem Thun und Lassen darstellt."[76] Weiss[77] adds that it is Christ himself, with whom we are united, who effects the "Annahme seiner Sinne und Handlungsweise." Meyer had already remarked, in reference to Melanchton, that it is the "praesens efficacia Christi . . ., was das Angezogenhaben Christi von der Annahme anderer Lehrmuster unterscheidet."[78] Melanchton[79] himself said, in explanation of Rom. XIII, 14, that we put on Christ, in the first place, when we clothe ourselves and cover our sins with his merits as with a garment; and in the second place, by the "efficax praesentia" of Christ, the Son of God. The Logos, he explains, is "praesens et efficax" by the "vox Evangelii," manifesting the mercy of the Father. The Holy Ghost is infused into the hearts of the faithful, "ut laetentur in Deo." By faith their hearts are conformed to the Logos, who again is the "imago Dei." The effect of this process, as he says, is that we are made a "templum et domicilium Dei."

Thayer[80] also interprets both phrases as meaning "to become so possessed of the mind of Christ as in thought, feeling and action to resemble him and, as it were, reproduce the life he lived." By way of illustration he refers to similar expressions of Greek and Roman writers. Barnes notes that the phrase to "put on a person" is often used by Greek authors, and means "to imbibe his principles; to imitate his example; to copy his spirit; to become like him."[81]

[72] *Brief an d. Röm.*, 483.
[73] *Ep. to the Rom.*, 408.
[74] *Paul. Briefe u. Hebräerbrief*, 542.
[75] *Brief an d. Röm.*, 424.
[76] *Op. cit.*, 483.
[77] *Op. cit.*, 542.
[78] *Op. cit.*, 483.
[79] *Opera*, XV, 1023.
[80] *Greek-Eng. Lex. of N. T.*, 214.
[81] *Notes on Rom.*, 322.

5. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ = Expression for Discipleship.—Schleusner[82] attaches a twofold meaning to our figure. Ἐνδύω τινά, he says, is used either of one "qui aliquem doctorem sequitur, qui alterum imitatur eique similis fieri conatur," or of one, "qui arctissimis cum aliquo conjungitur vinculis." Accordingly, referring to Gal. III, 27, he says the baptized are united with Christ "arctissimis vinculis." As is evident from the words quoted above, discipleship, according to Schleusner, implies imitation; and in this sense he understands Rom. XIII, 14: "Imitamini sensus et animum Domini nostri J. C." He cites Dion. Hal. as an authority for the use of ἐνδύεσθαί τινα in the sense of to imitate, and he adds that also in other writers the phrase "Platonem, Pythagoram induere" is used in the meaning of "fieri discipulum Pythagorae et Platonis, se conformare ad ejus exemplum."[83] Similarly, Barnes,[84] commenting on Schleusner's words, observes that the "Greek writers speak of putting on Plato, Socrates, etc.," in the meaning of "to take them as instructors; to follow them as disciples." Hence he understands the "induere Christum" in Rom. XIII, 14, as meaning "to take him as a pattern and guide, to imitate his example, to obey his precepts, to become like him."[85]

6. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ = Intimate Union and Life-Fellowship.—Ellicott[86] remarks that from the instances collected by Wetstein it is clear that ἐνδύεσθαί τινα is a "strong expression, denoting the complete assumption of the nature etc. of another." Ford,[87] in his exposition of Rom. XIII, 14, declares that St. Paul's expression denotes "the most intimate spiritual union and appropriation, such as is indicated by our baptism into Christ." Ellicott[88] himself interprets the "induere Christum" in Gal. III, 27, as implying a most intimate union with Christ,—"we are brought εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ἰδέαν (Chrys.) with him"; so that, as Calvin[89] had said, before God we bear the name and the person of Christ, and "in Ipso magis quam nobismet Ipsis censeamus." De Wette,[90] as was noted above, understands the phrase ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν as a "Bild der innigsten Geistesgemeinschaft mit Chr.";

[82] *Nov. Lex. Graeco-Lat. in N. T.*, I, 631.
[83] *Ibid.*
[84] *Op. cit.*, 322.
[85] *Ibid.*
[86] *Comm. on Gal.*, 89.
[87] *Comm. on Rom.*, 280.
[88] *Op. cit.*, 89.
[89] *Comm. on Gal. and Eph.*, 110.
[90] *Erklärung d. Briefes an d. Röm.*, 177.

while Philippi[91] calls it a "figure for entrance into most intimate union and life-fellowship with Him." As examples of this use of ἐνδύεσθαι, both authors refer to the Hebrew word לבשׁ as well as to the Greek and Latin classics.

The explanation of ἐνδύεσθαί τινα given by Borger[92] and approved by Bloomfield,[93] is essentially the same as the foregoing. It means, according to these writers, "homine aliquo familiariter uti; familiaritatem contrahere cum aliquo." Familiarity connotes union, and it is in this sense that they interpret the Pauline formula in Gal. III, 27. By Baptism, they say, we are united to Christ "arctissimo . . . vinculo."

Calmet[94] understands the phrase "indui aliquem" in the same sense; "nempe, res illius curare, unius esse sententiae, familiaiter uti." According to him, the "induere Christum" in Rom. XIII, 14, means to love and follow Christ, and to show forth "divini hujus exemplaris effigiem in gestis;"[95] whereas the form in Gal. III, 27, signifies to be filled with Christ's spirit, "ipsius spiritu perfusi," to be enriched with his gifts and made beloved sons of God.[96]

Turner[97] and Rendall[98] give no general meaning of the phrase ἐνδύεσθαί τινα, but maintain that the precise sense in each instance must be determined by the context. Turner gives to "induere Christum" in Rom. XIII, 14, the meaning to "become assimilated to the character of Christ," and to Gal. III, 27, to embrace "the religion of Christ."[99]

IV. The Metaphor "Induere Christum" Derived from Various Civil or Religious Customs

In order to explain the precise meaning of the Pauline formula, some commentators follow a course quite different from the one described. Abstracting from the philological origin of "induere Christum," they discover in the phrase a figure taken from the idea of putting on a garment, and maintain that it is used by St. Paul in reference to some incident or custom; but as to the nature of this fact or custom they are by no means agreed. The opinion

[91] *Comm. on Rom.*, 315.
[92] *Interpr. Ep. ad Gal.*, 246.
[93] *Recensio synop. Annot. Sacr.*, 406.
[94] *Comm. in N. T.*, III, 520.
[95] *Ibid.*
[96] *Op. cit.*, III, 835.
[97] *Notes on Rom.*, 96.
[98] *Ep. to the Gal.*, II, 174.
[99] *Op. cit.*, 96.

of exegetes on this point may be divided into three classes, according as they explain our metaphor by facts or customs that are Christian, Jewish, or pagan in origin.

1. "Induere Christum" Derived from Christian Customs

a) *From the Garments of Baptism*

Taking their cue from the words: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ" (Gal. III, 27), some interpreters conclude that St. Paul derived his simile from the custom of putting on clothes—in later times new clothes—after Baptism. This view is held as certain by Usteri, Macknight, and Beyschlag. Usteri remarks that St. Paul applies this figure to "die das äussere Leben wie das Innere des Gemüthes umfassende Verähnlichung und Vereinigung mit Christo."[100] Macknight simply adds that, in the Apostle's phrase, Christ signifies "the temper and virtues of Christ."[101] According to Beyschlag,[102] the practice of putting on the clothes—"perhaps in those days a new white baptismal robe"—suggested to Paul the idea of Baptism as the medium of our communion with Christ.

It is of interest to note that J. B. Lightfoot[103] seems undecided as to the correctness of this opinion. On the one hand, he deems it "scarcely probable" that "the ceremonial of baptism had become so definitely fixed at this early date, that an allusion to the white garments of the baptized" would speak for itself. On the other hand, after noting that the metaphor is very common in the LXX, he adds that in the context of a passage of St. Justin,[104] which he regards as a "reminiscence of this passage of St. Paul," "there is apparently an allusion to the baptismal robes."

Trollope[105] accords to this view only a mere probability; while Ellicott,[106] although deeming it "very plausible," rejects it. Other commentators are more positive in rejecting this explanation. They assert that the method of procedure was quite the opposite; that the language of St. Paul in the course of time gave rise to the custom of putting on new or white garments after Baptism. Already Musculus[107] advanced this view. According to him, the

[100] *Comm. über d. Gal.*, 135.
[101] *Apostolic Ep.*, II, 270.
[102] *N. T. Theol.*, II, 236.
[103] *Ep. to the Gal.*, 149-150.
[104] Migne, *P. G.*, 6, 745 A.
[105] *Comm. on N. T.*, II, 465.
[106] *Comm. on Gal.*, 89.
[107] *Comm. ad Gal. et Eph.*, 126.

early Christians, in order to express that by Baptism Christ is put on, clothed in a new and white garment those whom they baptized. Deyling,[108] who flourished in the beginning of the eighteenth century, shared the opinion of Musculus. The practice of putting on white garments after Baptism, and wearing them for eight days, he says, owes its origin to the Apostle's words, and first came into vogue in the beginning of the third century. Hasaeus,[109] a contemporary of Deyling, likewise rejects the explanation of the origin of the Pauline formula from the putting on of white garments after Baptism on the ground that this custom was not in vogue in the time of St. Paul. Of the more modern exegetes, Sieffert-Meyer[110] declines to accept this opinion for the same reason as Hasaeus. He adduces the common use of the figure of speech and the absence of any hint in the context as further general reasons for rejecting this as well as any other allusion that might be attached to St. Paul's words. Schaefer[111] also deems the currency of this mode of expression a sufficient reason for rejecting "zu seiner Motivierung" all allusions to any customs, and he mentions especially the "Anlegen von Kleidern bei der Taufe."

Like Musculus and Deyling, Schaff[112] is of opinion that the "figure of putting on Christ as a new dress gave rise afterwards to the custom of wearing white baptismal garments"; but he adds that there is "no trace that such a custom existed already in the Apostolic Church." Rendall[113] thinks that "perhaps the language of the Apostle contributed to the spread of the ceremonial." Yet he maintains that the "symbolism of white garments . . . differed materially" from the idea St. Paul wishes to express in Gal. III, 27. The white robes, he explains, "signified the cleansing effect of baptism"; whereas the Apostle, as the context shows, is speaking of "enfranchisement and emancipation from control."

b) *From the Water of Baptism*

Schmidt and Holzendorff apparently see in the phraseology of St. Paul in Gal. III, 27, an allusion to the waters of Baptism, which, like a garment, entirely covered the neophyte. So, they

[108] *Observat. Sacr.*, 326.
[109] *De Baptizatis Christum indutis*, 1009.
[110] *Brief an d. Gal.*, 228.
[111] *Erklärung d. zwei Briefe an d. Thess. u. an d. Gal.*, 302.
[112] *Pop. Comm. on N. T.*, III, 323.
[113] *Ep. to the Gal.*, II, 174.

say, those who are baptized are, as it were, "enveloped in Christ, so that they appear as the image of Christ, the Son of God."[114]

In a somewhat different way, H. J. Holtzmann[115] explains the "Christum induistis" in Gal. III, 27. According to his view, the immersion in Baptism represents "den Untergang des alten Fleischesmenschen," the emersion "den Hervorgang eines neuen, eines Geistesmenschen"; "der ganze Akt aber heisst 'den Christus anziehen.'"

2. "Induere Christum" Derived from Jewish Customs

a) *From the Inauguration of the High Priest*

A second class of exegetes, especially of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, think that St. Paul derived his image from Jewish customs. Deyling,[116] who, according to Wolf,[117] is the most celebrated of these authors, seeks to explain the Pauline form of speech by referring to the solemn inauguration of the High Priest, which at the time of the second temple was performed by the vesting with the priestly robes, and which was called "multiplicatio vestium." At the time of the first temple, he explains, according to the express law of God (Ex. XXIX, 7), the High Priest was anointed before being admitted to his sacred functions. But at the time of the second temple, because, as the Talmudists say, the oil of unction, or holy oil, was no longer to be had, or because the Jews no longer attributed any sanctifying power to it, the priests were consecrated and initiated by the investment with eight garments. Consequently, to put on the robes of the High Priest was tantamount to being made High Priest. In this ceremony Deyling finds the key for the explanation of the "induere Christum" used by St. Paul. For in Baptism the Holy Ghost, like the holy oil, "is poured forth abundantly" on the Christians, and they are clothed with Christ, "hoc est justitia, merito, et sanctitate ejus, tamquam vestibus sanctissimis." Thereby they are inducted into the priestly office and consecrated priests of the New Law.

The part of the High Priest's accoutrement, which is most pertinent to our subject, he says, is the ציץ, the plate of gold on which were engraven the words קדש ליהוה —"Sanctitas Jeho-

[114] *Comm. on N. T.*, 305.
[115] *Lehrbuch d. neut. Theol.*, II, 197.
[116] *Observ. Sacr.*, 322 ff.
[117] *Curae Phil. et Crit.*, III, 738.

vae." This plate, which like a fillet encircled his forehead, was to signify that the High Priest was "ipso Jehova . . . indutus, summaque Dei sanctitate munitus ornatusque." After referring to a similar practice of the pagans, who wore coronets bearing the images of the gods, to show that they were their priests and devotees,[118] he remarks that, in contrast to the pagans and the Jewish High Priest, the Christians "non idoli nomen, nec nudas nominis יהוה literas, sed Christum ipsum, quando baptismi lavacro initiantur, et consecrantur, teste Apostolo, induunt."[119] For Christ is Jahve, our justice; He is the Holy One of the Lord, yes, Holiness itself. The golden plate, Deyling adds, possessed no inherent sanctity, as the Jews foolishly asserted; it was merely a symbol of the sanctity and justice of Christ with which the Christians are clothed in Baptism.

Before concluding, we shall adduce one more parallel mentioned by Deyling. As the High Priest had to observe a certain order in vesting with the sacerdotal robes, so the Christians must first put on Christ "in regeneratione et justificatione . . . imputative per fidem, . . . dein in renovatione imitative per sanctificationem.[120]

J. Lightfoot, who wrote in the middle of the seventeenth century, gives a similar explanation of the origin of the Pauline formula. He does not, however, derive the metaphor from the inauguration of the High Priest. He is of opinion that the metaphorical use by St. Paul of "induere" and "exuere" is to be explained by the vesting of the priests in the Old Law in general. For, when the turn of the priests came to minister in the temple, they first put off their ordinary clothes and, after washing themselves, vested with the sacerdotal robes. Also during the time of their service in the temple, they took off their priestly garments at night and resumed them again in the morning. "Ad hanc consuetudinem," he concludes, "alludere videntur haec loca Scripturae in quibus induere et exuere metaphorice sumuntur.[121]

b) *From the Making of the Covenant with the Jewish People*

Theodore Hasaeus[122] rejects the exegesis of Deyling chiefly because the whole analogy is limited to only one point, namely, that of clothing; whereas the fact or custom by which Gal. III, 27,

[118] Cfr. Suetonius, *Domitianus*, 4, 4.
[119] *Op. cit.*, 322.
[120] *Op. cit.*, 327.
[121] *Opera*, I, 650.
[122] *De Baptizatis Christum indutis*, 1018 ff.

is to be explained, must represent both a clothing and a washing. Also, he rejects, without comment, as unsatisfactory, the opinion advanced by J. Lightfoot and others, which contains both these elements. Only that fact or custom, he asserts, can serve as an adequate explanation of the expression "induere Christum" in Gal. III, 27, which contains the vestige of a washing and a clothing; the latter, however, must be of such a nature that it suggests the putting on of Christ as a garment. Moreover, the symbolic meaning of this fact or custom must have been kept alive in the minds of Jews and Christians by some ceremony. Finally, it must agree with the purpose St. Paul had in view. All these elements, he thinks, are contained "in illustri illa populi Judaici in numerum Foederatorum Dei aggregatione" and in the Jewish and the Christian rites to which this fact gave rise.

To obtain a fair idea of the nature of this interpretation, it will be sufficient to examine briefly the author's exposition of his third point; namely, that the putting on of the clothes on the memorable occasion referred to may be regarded as a type of the putting on of Christ as a garment. The cloud under cover of which God appeared when he gave the Law on Sinai, was the same as the famous pillar of cloud and of fire, out of which God thereafter was wont to speak to His people. But, as is admitted even by the Jews, He who spoke from the cloud and promulgated the Law, was the Son of God. But this cloud or pillar, because it covered and surrounded the people, is represented under the picture of a garment. This contention he seeks to prove especially by passages from sacred and profane writers who describe a cloud after the manner of a garment, and from the fact that the water trickled down from out the cloud and surrounded the people like a garment. Since—so he would have us conclude—at the time of the making of the Covenant, after the people had washed themselves and put on their clothes—perhaps fresh clothes —Christ spoke through a cloud which bears some resemblance to a garment, the act of the people's dressing may be conceived as a putting on of Christ.

3. "Induere Christum" Derived from Pagan Customs

a) *From the "Toga Virilis"*

The figure "induere Christum," some authors hold, has been borrowed by St. Paul from the custom of changing the "toga praetexta" for the "toga virilis." When the Roman youth donned

the "toga virilis," he was emancipated from the domestic rule and ushered into the ranks of citizens. The investment of a youth with man's dress was celebrated by religious rites.[123] To this custom Bengel[124] and Fausset[125] refer St. Paul's words when they call Christ our "toga virilis." Bengel adds, in explanation of Gal. III, 27, that, consequently, the Christians are not estimated by what they were but that they are alike of Christ and in Christ,—namely, sons of God.[126]

Rendall, however, infers from St. Paul's phrase not the idea of divine sonship but that of enfranchisement and emancipation from control. As the youth donned the "toga virilis" when he became of age, so is the Christian "invested at his Baptism with the robe of spiritual manhood," and thereby he comes into the possession of the "independence of a grown up son."[127]

Cornelius a Lapide[128] and Crocio[129] think that St. Paul refers also to the toga of the Hebrews. They add that with the toga the youths, as it were, put on "virum et virilem animum, virtutem et decus." Wolf[130] says Crocio's view derives no slight degree of probability from the words of St. Paul, who, on the one hand, compares the Law with a pedagogue and the Jews with infants, and, on the other hand, alludes to the manhood or majority of the Galatians, who were converted to Christ. To illustrate the first point, Wolf quotes Crocio's words in which he compares the moral law to a strict pedagogue, whose duty it was to lead the pupils to Christ; the ceremonial law to the "toga puerilis," which prefigured the "toga virilis" of Christ; and the judicial law, to a nurse, who guarded the Jews against what might harm them. On the other hand, remarks Wolf, when St. Paul says the Galatians are no longer under the Law, as a pedagogue (v. 25), and calls them sons (v. 26), *i.e.*, adults, he hints at their majority. The exegete concludes that the Christians who have put on Christ can well be compared to the Roman youths who "toga virili aetatis virilis et libertatis quoque argumentum praeferebant."[131]

[123] Cfr. Rendall, *Ep. to the Gal.*, II, 174.
[124] *Gnomon of N. T.*, II, 360.
[125] *Comm. on O. and N. T.*, II, 332.
[126] *Op. cit.*, II, 360.
[127] *Op. cit.*, II, 174.
[128] *Comm. in Scrip. S.*, XVIII, 27.
[129] *Comm. in Ep. Pauli Minores*, I, 96.
[130] *Op. cit.*, III, 739.
[131] *Ibid.*

b) *From the Initiation of the Sophists*

In their search for a suitable explanation of the Pauline formula, interpreters have gone so far as to suggest that the figure was derived from the initiation of the sophists. In ancient Greece, when a young man wished to be enrolled in the ranks of the sophists, he was ceremoniously conducted to the public baths and there clothed with a distinctive garb (*τρίβων*), which none but a sophist could wear. This initiation ceremony Hasaeus[132] mentions in passing as a possible, though not satisfactory, explanation of "induere Christum."

c) *From Seneca or Stoicism*

Between the epistles of St. Paul and the writings of Seneca there are such striking parallels in thought and construction that some have deemed the two authors pupils, one of the other.[133] One of these parallels bears on our subject. Seneca exhorts Lucilium: "Indue magni viri animum et ab opinionibus volgi secede paulisper."[134] Pfleiderer[135] notes the similarity between this exhortation and that contained in Rom. XIII, 14; but he does not think St. Paul borrowed his phrase from Seneca or vice versa. Clemen remarks that the resemblance "is one of expression only."[136] Pfleiderer[137] thinks that the parallels between St. Paul's style and Seneca's prove that both drew from a common source, namely the Greek culture of the time, "which was deeply imbued with Stoic conceptions," and which, moreover, exercised an influence on the Hellenistic Jews. Clemen,[138] too, admits that St. Paul was "partially indebted for his style to Stoicism," which flourished at Tarsus.

d) *From the Mystery Religions*

Perhaps the most interesting explication of our metaphor is that which derives it from the mystery religions. The most striking similarities between Christianity and the ancient religions of the Orient are those that refer to man's rebirth and his union with the deity. In the mystery religions, man's regeneration and union with his god is frequently expressed by a change of garment.

[132] *De Baptizatis Christum indutis*, 1011.
[133] Cfr. Pfleiderer, *Urchristentum*, I, 30.
[134] *Lib.* VII, *Ep.* V (67), 12.
[135] *Op. cit.*, I, 41.
[136] *Primit. Christ.*, 61.
[137] *Op. cit.*, I, 41.
[138] *Op. cit.*, 61.

In the prehistoric period, divinities were represented under the form of animals; and man, in taking the name and the semblance of his gods, believed that he identified himself with them. Even the ancient Romans clothed themselves with animal skins "be it that they believed they thus entered into communion with the monstrous idols which they worshipped, or that, in enveloping themselves in the pelts of their flayed victims, they conceived their bloody tunics to possess some purifying virtue."[139] These primitive practices left their traces in numerous cults. The Roman mystics of later days put on cloth and paper masks, which represented the deity they worshipped. The initiates of the different mysteries in Greece and Asia Minor bore the title of Bear, Ox, Colt, and similar names. But let us examine more in detail the alleged analogies with St. Paul's expression that are found in the different mysteries.

a. Egyptian Mysteries.[140]—The soul of one who is admitted to the mysteries of Isis, travels at night through the twelve houses of the zodiac, and in each his body is consecrated by a new garment. The putting on of these garments signifies that he has undergone twelve transformations. In the morning, the initiated is clothed with the heavenly garment; a burning torch is placed in his right hand, and on his head a crown, from which palm-branches protrude, like so many rays. Thus arrayed he is placed on a pedestal before the goddess as a statue of the sun-god and is revered by the assembled mystics as a god. His divine regeneration is then celebrated with a feast; and for a few days the initiated can enjoy the unspeakable happiness of being god's image. Thereupon, he leaves his heavenly garment in the temple, where it is kept for him, and returns to the earth. If the goddess so desires, the mystery must be renewed. The renewal, however, can be effected only by the putting on of the heavenly garment. After his death, the mystic is again clothed with this garment or with a simple black and white dress, which designates the wearer as the Logos. The clothing with these garments is to signify the union of the deceased with his god.

β. Phrygian Mysteries.[141]—The same idea pervades the Phrygian Mysteries. The mystic is decked in a wonderful festive

[139] Cumont, *Oriental in Rom. Paganism*, 153-154.
[140] Cfr. Reitzenstein, *Hellen. Mysterienreligionen*, 29-30.
[141] Cfr. Reitzenstein, *Op. cit.*, 32.

robe and a crown during the initiation, which consists in a bath, not with water, but with the blood of a bull. When the dress and the crown are tinged with the blood, he steps forth to be venerated as a god by the assembly. His dress is preserved for him; but after twenty years he must renew the consecration, at which he again wears the garment and thereby again becomes god.

γ. *Persian Mysteries.*[142]—The cult of Mithra embodies similar ideas. In the liturgy of Mithra, which was strongly influenced by the Egyptian mysteries, the mystic who wishes to be reborn and to become a son of god wanders through the heavens and calls out for his own heavenly body which God has formed for him. This body he must put on instead of his earthly body; but after the initiation he must resume the garment of his earthly body.

Cumont says that there were seven degrees of initiation in the mysteries of Mithra, and that the mystic successively assumed the names of Raven, Occult, Soldier, Lion, Persian, Runner of the Sun, and Father. "These strange appellations," he continues, "were no empty epithets with no practical bearing. On certain occasions the celebrants donned garbs suited to the titles that had been accorded them."[143] On various bas-reliefs, they are represented as carrying the counterfeit heads of animals, of soldiers, and of Persians.

Dölger,[144] to prove that the mystics wore the masks of their degree of initiation, refers especially to a representation of Mithra-communion on the bas-relief of Konjica. Here, on both sides of the table, we see mystics wearing animal masks, which, as Dölger emphasizes, cover only the face.

δ. *Babylonian Mysteries.*—To prove that these ideas were current also in the Babylonian mysteries, Dölger[145] calls attention to a relief in bronze which pictures the exorcism of a sick man. The relief is divided into two parts. Above, there are seven figures with animal heads, which represent the demons, who, according to the ideas of the Babylonians, are the cause of disease. Below, on a pallet, lies the sick man with his hands raised in supplication to the deity. At each end of the bed two figures, wrapped in a fish garment, are performing the exorcism. These figures repre-

[142] Cfr. Reitzenstein, *Ibid.*
[143] *Op. cit.*, 152.
[144] ΙΧΘΥΣ, 148.
[145] *Op. cit.*, 147.

sent priests who are devoted to the cult of the fish deity Ea-Oannes. Dölger concludes that "wenn nun babylonische Priester im Fischgewand eingehüllt erscheinen, so ist damit sinnbildlich dargestellt die engste Vereinigung mit der Gottheit, dadurch, dass man sie wie ein Gewand anzieht."[146]

We have seen that the idea of putting on the garment of a god in order to express union with him, is quite common in the mystery religions. It need not surprise us, therefore, that students of the comparative study of religions assert St. Paul derived his idea of putting on Christ as a garment from the mysteries.

But the discovery is not new. Already Hasaeus, who wrote in the beginning of the eighteenth century, referred in passing to the initiation into the mysteries of Isis and Mithra as possible explanations of the origin of St. Paul's formula. He rejects this view as unsatisfactory, however, chiefly because, as he says, "Apostolus scribit ad Judaeos, quibus illa gentilium sacra, ad quae ἀμυήτοις vix aliquis accessus concedebatur, aut prorsus non, aut parum sane perspecta atque explorata erant."[147]

In our own times, however, Clemen says that the expression "to put on Christ" "might ultimately be traced to the belief—which was probably no longer held even in regard to the Mysteries in general—that the participant in the rites is physically united with the deity."[148]

Dölger first discusses the dependence of St. Paul's formula on the cult of Mithra. After pointing out that this form of worship was spread also in Tarsus, the Apostle's native city, he states that, if it is true that in the cult of Mithra masks were worn in the religious services already in the first half of the first century, "wäre es an und für sich nicht undenkbar, dass Paulus bei seinem Worte vom 'Anziehen Christi' hierauf Bezug genommen hätte." But he adds immediately, "doch fehlt der Hauptvergleichungspunkt: das Anziehen des Göttlichen." St. Paul, he explains, is speaking of the transformation into Christ, of the putting on of the spirit of Christ; whereas the masks, worn in the worship of Mithra, were indeed a symbol of the degree of initiation, but not of the putting on of the deity. This idea, he contends, is brought out in the picture described above of the exorcism of the sick man. For the fish garment covered, not only the head, but the whole body, and thereby expressed "die engste Beziehung zu Ea-Oannes,

[146] *Op. cit.*, 147.
[147] *Op. cit.*, 1014.
[148] *Primit. Christ.*, 232.

dem Gott der Wasserwohnung, der Fischgottheit." From this fact he draws the conclusion: "Wäre zur Zeit des hl. Paulus diese morgenländisch-babylonische Auffassung von dem Anziehen des Fischgottes auch in Tarsus, bezw. Kleinasien und Palästina bekannt gewesen,—der Beweis steht jedoch noch aus—so könnte man vielleicht mit Recht annehmen, dass der Apostel mit Bezug auf die geläufige heidnische Vorstellung sein Wort vom Anziehen Christi geprägt hätte."[149] But this, he says, must remain an open question. Dölger puts it down as his opinion that we need not admit a direct allusion to any symbolic investiture to explain the phrase of St. Paul, for the reason that the idea of ἐνδύεσθαι "als das Anziehen einer geistigen Qualität oder Gemütsverfassung" was very familiar to the Orientals.[150]

Steinmann follows Dölger pretty closely. After referring to the rites in vogue in the Babylonian and Persian mysteries, he concludes: "Sollte in diesen Bräuchen wirklich der Gedanke der Vergottung durch Anziehen des Gewandes ausgedrückt sein, so könnte man vielleicht mit Recht annehmen, dass der Apostel mit Bezug auf die geläufige Vorstellung sein Wort vom Anziehen Christi geprägt hätte."[151] Yet, after recalling that this metaphor is found in Seneca and is frequently used by St. Paul, he prefers to regard the figure as an "Ausdruck der bilderreichen Sprache des Orients."[152] We see from the foregoing review that even Catholic authors are much inclined to attribute some influence of the mystery religions on the use of our metaphor by St. Paul.

e) *From the Worship of Comus*

Before concluding this part of our investigation, we should like to note a few explanations taken from pagan religious customs, which are said to apply especially or solely to Rom. XIII, 14. The first of these explanations is drawn from the worship of Comus, the god of festive mirth, in the later mythology of the Greeks. In the orgies celebrated in honor of this deity, men and women interchanged their clothes and gave themselves up to immoral practices. To this dissolute custom St. Paul is said to allude when he commands the Romans, as it were, to put on, not Comus, but Christ. This opinion is held by John H. Majus and is mentioned by Wolf.[153]

[149] *Op. cit.*, 149.
[150] *Op. cit.*, 149-150.
[151] *Briefe an d. Thess. u. Gal.*, 96.
[152] *Ibid.*
[153] *Curae Phil. et Crit.*, III, 271.

The latter, however, vigorously opposes this view. He grants that in regard to Rom. XIII, 14, the gloss has a slight degree of probability ("speciem exiguam") on account of the word κῶμος occurring in verse 13; but he maintains that the context of "induere Christum" in Gal. III, 27, clearly proves that this interpretation is entirely false, for St. Paul here speaks of an entirely different matter, namely "de Christo, fide in baptismo ad justitiam induendo."[154] He adds that, in his opinion, the metaphor in Rom. XIII, 14, refers, not to holiness that is not tainted by the vices of rioting and drunkenness (κώμων, μεθῶν), but "inprimis ad justitiam Christi tenendam et solicite servandam."[155]

Kypke[156] adopts an explanation of St. Paul's formula similar to that held by Majus. He does not, however, refer the words of Paul only to the worship of Comus, but in general to the κῶμοι, the nightly riotings that were held in honor of various gods. In these revels, men and women not only exchanged clothes, but frequently engaged in dances in which they wore masks. He concludes that St. Paul, in his exhortation, referred to these πρόσωπα and σχήματα and exhorted the Romans to flee the shameful vices practised on these occasions.

f) *From the Sacra Saliorum*

We may briefly note two other explanations of Rom. XIII, 14, which Deyling[157] tells us were held by his contemporaries. Some, he says, refer the words in question to the festivities of the Salii. Every year the Salii, who were priests of Mars, in memory of the small oval shield that fell from heaven during the reign of Numa Pompilius, marched through the city. Each carried a shield on his left arm and in his right hand a short staff with which he struck the shield. At the altars and the temples of the god they halted and, singing a special chant, danced a war dance.

g) *From the Lupercalia*

Another custom mentioned by Deyling[158] which is made to serve as a key to "induere Christum" in Rom. XIII, 14, is the Lupercalia. After offering sacrifices to Lupercus and indulging in a banquet at which wine flowed plentifully, the priests, half naked and half clad in goat skins, ran through the streets at night and with thongs made of goat skins struck every person they met,

[154] *Op. cit.*, III, 741.
[155] *Ibid.*
[156] *Observat. Sacr.*, II, 185.
[157] *Observat. Sacr.*, 328 ff.
[158] *Op. cit.*, 329-330.

especially women, who sought the whipping from an opinion that it averted sterility and the pangs of childbirth.

After reviewing the various customs proposed as the key for the explanation of "induere Christum," we may note that some authors, like Ellicott,[159] Sieffert-Meyer,[160] Cornely,[161] and Schaefer,[162] explicitly deny all reference of St. Paul's words to any custom, whether Christian, Jewish, or pagan. The chief reasons for their rejection of all such explanations are summed up by Sieffert: "Geschichtl. rituelle Beziehungen des Bildes sind bei der allgemeinen Gangbarkeit desselben, und da der Kontext durchaus keine Andeutung enthält, abzuweisen."[163]

Corollary—Relation Between Gal. III, 27, and Rom. XIII, 14, in General

Commentators, old and new, have compared the use of the Pauline formula in Gal. III, *27*, with its use in Rom. XIII, 14. In the former passage, the putting on of Christ is referred to our justification, in the latter to our sanctification.[164] Some authors refer the putting on of Christ mentioned in Gal. III, *27*, also to our sanctification, and that spoken of in Rom. XIII, 14, to our justification.[165]

In Gal. III, *27*, the phrase is used in a "dogmatic" (Cook,[166] Schaff,[167] Sieffert-Meyer[168]) or "dogmatic-liturgical" sense Zöckler[169]); in Rom. XIII, 14, in an "ethical" (Cook,[166] Schaff,[167] Sieffert-Meyer,[168] Denney[170]) or "ethical-ascetical" sense (Zöckler[169]). In the former passages, the putting on of Christ is "represented as a finished fact" (Schaff,[171] Lipsius,[172] Sieffert-Meyer[173]); whereas, in the latter, it is the "subject of an ethical

[159] *Comm. on Gal.*, 89.
[160] *Brief an d. Gal.*, 228.
[161] *Comm. in II Cor. et Gal.*, 517.
[162] *Erklärung d. zwei Briefe an d. Thess. u. an d. Gal.*, 302.
[163] *Op. cit.*, 228.
[164] Cfr. Calvin, *Comm. on Rom.*, 490. D'Outrein, *Spicilegium*, 366 ff. Deyling, *Observ. Sacr.*, 327. Wesley, *Notes on N. T.*, 412. Godet, *Comm. on Rom.*, 451.
[165] Cfr. Pool, *Annotations on H. Bible*, 526. Guyse, *Practical Expositor*, III, 541. Whedon, *Comm. on N. T.*, III, 384. Binney, *People's Comm. on N. T.*, 428.
[166] *Holy Bible with Comm.*, III, 214.
[167] *Pop. Comm. on N. T.*, III, 323.
[168] *Brief an d. Gal.*, 228.
[169] *Briefe an d. Thess. u. Gal.*, 71.
[170] *Ep. to the Rom.*, 699.
[171] *Op. cit., III*, 323.
[172] *Briefe an d. Gal. Röm. Phil.*, 171.
[173] *Op. cit.*, 228.

exhortation" (Lipsius[172]) to a "continuous duty" (Schaff[174]). "In both cases," adds Schaff, "vital fellowship is meant, but each step in the growing conformity to Christ is a new putting on of Him."[175]

Luther[176] says the putting on of Christ mentioned in Gal. III, 27, is "according to the gospel," that mentioned in Rom. XIII, 14, is "according to the law."

Jülicher[177] warns us not to conclude from the use of this phrase by St. Paul in his exhortation to the Romans that there was no trace of the new spiritual life left in them. He merely used this emphatic expression to stir up their conscience thoroughly.

Valuation and Conclusion of the First Chapter

After reviewing the interpretations of "induere Christum" by commentators in medieval and modern times, we are in a position to state the net results and estimate their value at least to some extent. We have noted an astounding variety of opinions concerning the meaning and the origin of our metaphor. A number of exegetes think that the Pauline formula is immediately derived from the expression "to put on a garment"; but they vary greatly in their explication of the fundamental idea expressed by this metaphor. Union, imitation, profession of discipleship, covering, and protection are the main ideas proffered. Some see in the expression a reference to the moral nakedness of the natural man, or of man in the state of original or personal sin. Others think the phrase used in Rom. XIII, 14, is equivalent to that other phrase of St. Paul, "put on the armour of light."

Another class of interpreters seek to establish the philological origin of the phrase. Of these some contend it is of Hebrew, others of Greek origin. The principal idea contained in the original, and consequently in St. Paul's expression, according to those who stand for the Hebrew origin of the phrase, is union, abundance, adoption, assumption of qualities, virtues, and sentiments, or acquisition of anything whereby we are honored or dishonored. Cremer insists that the expression denotes a state or condition, and not conduct. The meanings given to the original phrase and to the Pauline expression by those who emphasize the Greek origin, are still more numerous. By some commentators the ex-

[174] *Op. cit.*, III, 323 and 134.
[175] *Op. cit.*, III, 134.
[176] *Comm. on Gal.*, 436.
[177] *Brief an d. Röm.*, 311.

pressions are made to imply imitation in general; by others external or internal imitation, or both internal and external imitation, or discipleship, or intimate union and life-fellowship, or finally familiarity. Turner and Rendall say no general meaning can be given; but the sense must be determined by the context in every instance where the phrase is used.

A third class of authors abstract from the philological origin of the phrase. Assuming the phrase to be a figure taken from the idea of putting on a garment, they maintain that St. Paul alludes to some fact or custom, by which his words must be explained. Some of these commentators think the Apostle derived the simile from Christian customs: from the garments of Baptism, or the waters of Baptism. Others seek an explanation in Jewish customs or incidents; namely, the inauguration of the High Priests under the second temple, the vesting of the priests with their ministerial garbs, or the making of the Covenant on Mount Sinai. Finally, others propose pagan customs as the origin of the Pauline phrase. The investiture with the "toga virilis" or with the cloak of the sophists, or the dressing of the initiates in the various mystery religions with a garment to express their union with the deity, have been advanced as explanations. A few authors have suggested that the "induere Christum," especially as used in Rom. XIII, 14, contains an allusion to the worship of Comus or to the Sacra Saliorum or to the Lupercalia. On the other hand, others positively deny all reference to any custom or fact, whether Christian, Jewish, or pagan in origin.

This tremendous confusion of ideas clearly shows that we have before us one of the greatest N. T. problems still awaiting a solution. The investigation, however, of the conflicting and confusing interpretations of our metaphor is by no means useless for the solution of our difficulty. For, in the investigation of a problem, a historical review is bound to reveal the strength of one theory and the weakness of another. It shows which methods are impossible and which may be practicable for the correct explanation. So it is in our case. Although by our historical review we have not been able to find the solution of our problem, still in the labyrinth of opinions we can find a thread, which, if followed, may lead us to the solution.

We have observed that some exegetes, in order to discover the fundamental idea contained in our metaphor, have sought first of all to establish the philological origin of the phrase together

with the meaning of the original. Commentators have noted a few examples of the very phrase of St. Paul, *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*, in Greek authors. In the face of these facts, is it not reasonable to seek the key for the solution of our problem in the meaning and the use of this phrase by other Greek writers? For unless the context or the usage and spirit of St. Paul expressly demand the contrary, it must be assumed that he wrote *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* in the current understanding of the phrase *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*. But just here lies the difficulty. For, as we have noticed, the answers that have been given to the all-important question concerning the precise meaning of this expression in Greek literature, are extremely conflicting. Hence it seems to be necessary for the solution of our problem to seek some authority who stands in close touch with the Hellenic world and with St. Paul, and who can, therefore, more surely unfold to us the hidden meaning of this phrase both in the Greek literature and in the writings of the Apostle. No one is better suited to this task than the great St. John Chrysostom. For, both as an interpreter of the meaning of Greek phraseology and as an exegete of St. Paul's epistles, he ranks foremost among the scholars of the early Church. An ardent admirer of the Apostle of the Gentiles, he devoted himself to an assiduous study of his writings. In his exegesis, he is faithful to the historico-philological method. He seeks above all to establish the literal sense of Holy Scripture; and to this end he often prefaces his explanation with a historical introduction, and at times he even stops to clear up grammatical difficulties. Well has it been said that "no one has ever interpreted Holy Scripture so successfully as Chrysostom, with such thoroughness and prudence, one might say, with such sobriety and accuracy, yet with so much depth and comprehensiveness."[178]

For this task of exegesis he was eminently fitted. Reared and educated at Antioch, he was quite familiar with the thoughts and customs of the Oriental world. Besides, he was conversant with Greek philosophy and customs, was well versed in the Greek classics, and he lived at the time of the later phase of the *κοινὴ διάλεκτος*. Thus he not only was a grand representative of Oriental and Hellenic culture, but he also possessed a perfect knowledge of the ancient Greek literature as well as of the linguistic *milieu* in which St. Paul moved and wrote.

[178] Bardenhewer, *Patrol.*, 339.

CHAPTER II

INTERPRETATION OF "INDUERE CHRISTUM" ACCORDING TO ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

As is evident from the first part of our investigation, there exists among commentators utter confusion concerning the meaning of the Pauline formula. In the present chapter we shall consult the writings of St. John Chrysostom, the greatest authority on exegesis in the early Greek Church, in the hope that he may throw some light on this obscure question. We shall examine in particular the two passages in his commentaries referring to the "induere Christum" in Rom. XIII, 14, and Gal. III, 27. We shall first take up his commentary on Rom. XIII, 14, which is contained in his XXIV Homily on this Epistle.

I. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ IN ROM. XIII, 14

1. Exhortation to Put on the Arms of Light

In Rom. XIII, 12, Paul tells us: "The night is passed and the day is at hand. Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness and put on the arms of light"—*ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός.* The arms of light which we should put on, according to Chrysostom, produce a twofold effect in us: first, they place us in safety, because they are arms—*ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ σε καθίστησιν· ὅπλα γάρ ἐστι·* Second, they make us radiant, because they are arms of light—*καὶ καταλάμπεσθαι ποιεῖ· φωτὸς γάρ ἐστιν ὅπλα.*[1] We should not be terrified because Paul speaks of arms; for we must indeed fight, but we need not endure hardships and fatigue. For, Chrysostom continues, this is not a war but a choral dance and a high festival. He concludes: Such is the nature (*i.e.*, the power) of these arms, such the power of the leader—*τοιαύτη τῶν ὅπλων τούτων ἡ φύσις, τοιαύτη ἡ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ δύναμις.*[2] Who is this leader? Evidently Christ, whose soldiers we are.[3] It is interesting that our Doctor here refers the safety and splendor which the arms give us to Christ's power.

[1] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 623.
[2] *Ibid.*
[3] Cfr. II Tim. II, 3.

According to the exegesis of Chrysostom, the arms of light are a superior force and power and, if we put them on or enter into them [4] (*ἐνδυσώμεθα*), they produce a change in us and conform us to themselves; they give us safety and splendor. The expression *ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα* must mean: let us enter under this power, let us give ourselves up to this power and consequently be changed by it and conformed to it. Later we shall see what Paul understands by "the arms" to which we should surrender ourselves.

2. Exhortation to "Put off Evil"

In v. 13, Paul exhorts us to walk honestly, as in the day; thereupon he enumerates the principal works we should throw off. They are rioting and drunkenness, chambering and impurities, contention and envy. Chrysostom characterizes these sins as the bad garment—*τὰ πονηρὰ ἱμάτια*—of which we should strip ourselves.

3. Exhortation to Put on Christ

But, he says, Paul was not satisfied to strip us (*ἀποδύσας*) of these garments; he wished thereupon to decorate us splendidly (*καλλωπίζει*). But what is this new decoration? Paul tells us in the remarkable words: *ἀλλὰ ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν* (v. 14).

The meaning of the words "induere Christum" Chrysostom sets forth by contrasting them with the "exuere" and with the "induere arma."

a) The "exuere" of Paul in v. 12, refers to the *κακία*; but in speaking of this, says our Doctor, the Apostle mentions only deeds —*ὅτε μὲν γὰρ περὶ τῆς κακίας ἔφησεν, ἔργα ἔλεγεν.*[5] These are the *πονηρὰ ἱμάτια.*

b) The "induere" of Paul, therefore, naturally refers to the *ἀρετή* in contrast to the *κακία.* Here, however, as Chrysostom explains, Paul mentions not deeds but, in the first place, arms—*ὅτε δὲ περὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς οὐκέτι ἔργα ἀλλ' ὅπλα.*[6] Thereby, he continues, the Apostle shows that virtue places him who possesses it in complete safety and complete splendor—*δεικνὺς ὅτι ἐν πάσῃ ἀσφαλείᾳ καθίστησιν ἡ ἀρετὴ τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτὴν, καὶ ἐν πάσῃ λαμπρότητι.*[7] Thus we see that the *ὅπλα* in v. 12 is a metaphorical expression for *ἀρετή.* By this explanation of *ὅπλα* Chrysostom evidently characterizes virtue as a superior power; and, if we enter into it (*ἐνδυσώμεθα*),

[4] Ἐνδύω literally = to go into; cfr. Liddell-Scott, *Greek-Eng. Lex.*, 476.
[5] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 623.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 623-624.

we are possessed of and changed by it; we are made perfectly safe and brilliant. Ἐνδυσώμεθα τὰ ὅπλα then means: let us give ourselves over to the power of virtue; the ἔχοντα simply expresses the fact of possession.

c) But, says Chrysostom, Paul does not pause here but passes on to something greater, something far more tremendous—ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἄγων τὸν λόγον, ὃ πολλῷ φρικωδέστερον ἦν.[8] This tremendous mystery is expressed in the following words: αὐτὸν τὸν Δεσπότην δίδωσιν ἡμῖν ἱμάτιον, αὐτὸν τὸν βασιλέα—he gives us the Lord Himself as a garment; and he enforces this phrase by the words, the King Himself. The last words, it seems, are added to bring out in strong relief the contrast to the arms. We are the soldiers of Christ our King; but we "put on," not only the arms of our King, but the King Himself. The expression ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν might at first sight seem to be a mere metaphor, especially since it is used in connection with the figurative phrase ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός. But Chrysostom does not regard it in this light. He tells us that the Apostle uses the phrase ἐνδυσώμεθα . . . τὰ ὅπλα in order to show more strikingly the effects produced by virtue; but the expression ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν is something greater, something far more awe-inspiring—πολλῷ φρικωδέστερον. It is something mysterious, which excites wonder and awe. Therefore it goes beyond the metaphor; and Chrysostom, instead of explaining that the words of Paul τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, stand for something else, tells us they stand for what they express, namely αὐτὸν τὸν Δεσπότην . . . αὐτὸν τὸν βασιλέα. Note how he emphasizes the reality by prefixing the αὐτὸν to Δεσπότην and to βασιλέα. He says in substance: Put on not only the arms of the King, *i.e.*, virtue, but the Lord Himself, the King Himself.

4. Explanation of the ΕΝΔΥΣΑΣΘΕ—ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ

The question is: What is the precise and full meaning of this phrase? The words ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός, as we have seen, mean, according to Chrysostom's explanation: Let us give ourselves up to the power of virtue, which will effect that we have or possess virtue (τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτήν), and that, consequently, we are changed by it and conformed to it. By analogy we can infer the general meaning of the command ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν; viz., Give yourselves up to the power of Christ, so that you may possess Him and be changed by Him, and conformed to Him. Does this agree with Chrysostom's exposition of the words?

[8] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 624.

Chrysostom first explains the effect this "induere" produces in us. As is evident from the context and the explanation of Chrysostom given above, the words *ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν* are intended by the Apostle to refer to the acquisition or practice of virtue. Therefore, Chrysostom, in his explanation, likewise refers to virtue. To the words, he gives us the Lord Himself for a garment, the King Himself, he adds: for he who has put Him on, possesses virtue in its entirety—*Ὁ γὰρ τοῦτον περιβεβλημένος, ἅπασαν ἔχει καθόλου τὴν ἀρετήν.*

The first effect of the "induere arma" is our having, or possessing virtue—*τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτήν, i.e., ἀρετήν.* But he who has put on (*περιβεβλημένος*) Christ, says Chrysostom, possesses not only virtue but absolutely all virtue—*ἅπασαν ἔχει καθόλου τὴν ἀρετήν.* It is remarkable that he so strongly emphasizes the completeness of virtue by the double modifier *ἅπασαν* and *καθόλου.* The phrase *ἅπασα . . . καθόλου ἡ ἀρετή* must be regarded as personified in Christ, since it can not be said of any Christian that he possesses absolutely all virtue. The phrase then turns out to mean: he has, possesses Him, who is *ἅπασα καθόλου ἡ ἀρετή,* who is the personification and source of absolutely all virtue. The conclusion is naturally implied: and Christ will produce virtue in him who has put Him on.

Chrysostom next explains the greatness of this mystery. He can not find words to express it. To put on Christ means, in the first place, to be completely surrounded by Him. He comments: But in saying *Ἐνδύσασθε,* he bids us put Him around us on all sides—*πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς αὐτὸν περιβαλέσθαι κελεύει.*[9] This, he continues, is equivalent to the expression of Paul in Rom. VIII, 10: But if Christ be in you—*εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν,* and to his words in Eph. III, 16, 17, which Chrysostom quotes with a remarkable interpunctuation: That Christ may dwell in our inner man—*εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπον κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστόν.* This inner man is the soul; for, explains Chrysostom, he (Paul) wishes our soul to be a dwelling for Him (*οἰκίαν αὐτῷ*), and Him to be put about us as a garment —*ὡς ἱμάτιον ἡμῖν αὐτὸν περικεῖσθαι.*

The striking expressions which Chrysostom employs to explain the first effect of the "induere Christum," emphasize the reality of our possession of Christ or, which is the same, Christ's dwelling in us. Likewise, the "horrendum mysterium" of which Chrysostom speaks, excludes a figurative sense and points to this reality. Our real possession of Christ or His real indwelling in us, as it is

[9] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 624.

described by Chrysostom, implies the mystic union of the creature with Christ, its Lord and King.

Next, Chrysostom tells us the purpose of Christ's indwelling in us. Paul wishes Christ to be in us and about us, in order that He may be unto us all things, both from within and from without —*ἵνα πάντα αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ᾖ ἔσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν.* This last phrase implies that we are to give ourselves up wholly to the possession and power of Christ; we are to be perfectly subject to Him and to live only for Him; so that He, as our Lord and King, may rule and dominate our whole being. Christ is, therefore, here regarded as a superior power. If we enter into Him, He exercises His power over us by really uniting Himself to us, so that He can dominate our whole being. *Ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν* then means nothing else than give yourselves up to the possession and power of Christ, that He may exercise His power over you by uniting you to Himself in a real, mystic union and dominate your whole being. This meaning will become clearer as we proceed.

After explaining the first effect of the "induere," Chrysostom describes in detail how Christ exercises His power in us, how He seeks to unite Himself to us most intimately in order to be our all, —in order to dominate us wholly.

To this end he enumerates all the titles he can think of which can be applied to Christ to express His relation of dominion to His followers. For, he says, He is our fulness (*πλήρωμα*),—way, husband, bridegroom, root, drink, meat, life, apostle, high priest, teacher, father, brother, joint heir, sharer of the tomb and cross, suppliant, advocate to the Father, house, inhabitant, friend, foundation, cornerstone. Then he adds the titles which show our relation to Christ and which again point to His dominion over us. We are His members and heritage and building and branches and fellow workers.[10] Although he has enumerated all the titles he can, still he feels he has not fully expressed the truth contained in this mystery. He, therefore, asks: What is there that He does not wish to be to us, since He binds and unites us to Him in every way? This, he adds, is characteristic of one who loves exceedingly—*Τί γὰρ οὐ βούλεται ἡμῖν εἶναι, παντὶ τρόπῳ συγκολλῶν καὶ συνάπτων ἡμᾶς; ὅπερ τοῦ σφόδρα φιλοῦντός ἐστι.*

The mutual relations between Christ and us, which are enumerated above, not only express our intimate union with Christ, but imply also His power and dominion over us and our charac-

[10] Cfr. Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 624.

teristic of being His property. At the end of this passage, Chrysostom expressly tells us that Christ seeks to be our all by uniting and joining us to Him in every way. This uniting of us to Him, of course, presupposes the power and dominion of Christ over us, His property. Here then we have again the principal elements of the "horrendum mysterium," possession of us as His property and His actual dominion over us and our consequent real union with Him. But the mystery includes still more. Although Christ, as our Lord and King, has power and dominion over us, still the motive that guides Him in its exercise is His exceeding love for us. It is for this reason that He exercises His power by uniting us to Him in every way—*παντὶ τρόπῳ συγκολλῶν καὶ συνάπτων ἡμᾶς ; ὅπερ τοῦ σφόδρα φιλοῦντός ἐστι.*

Chrysostom continues his exposition thus: Obey then and, rousing thyself from sleep, put Him on (*ἔνδυσαι αὐτόν*), and when thou hast put Him on give up thy flesh to His bridle—*καὶ ἐνδυσάμενος εὐήνιον αὐτῷ πάρεχε τὴν σάρκα.* For this is what Paul intimates when he says, "Make not provision for the flesh in its concupiscences." The putting on of Christ here includes the subjection also of our flesh (body) to the power of Christ. Finally, after mentioning various vices that excite our lust, Chrysostom concludes: But thou, having put on Christ and thereby renounced all those things, seek only one thing, namely, to have a healthy body—*Ἀλλ' ὁ τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνδεδυμένος σὺ, πάντα ἐκεῖνα περικόψας, ἓν ζήτει μόνον, ὅπως ὑγιαίνουσαν ἔχῃς τὴν σάρκα.*[11]

According to Chrysostom's explanation given in the first half of the XXIV Homily on the Epistle to the Romans, the phrase *ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν* means:

a) Give yourselves up to the possession and dominion of Christ, who is your possessor as you are His property.

b) This power Christ exercises over you out of love; consequently

c) You are united to Him in every way; so that

d) He dwells actually in you and

e) Dominates your whole being, even your body.

5. Confirmation of the Reality of Christ's Indwelling in Us

Of the phrase *εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν*, which was cited by Chrysostom to show that the "induere Christum" effects the real indwelling

[11] Migne, P. G., 60, 624.

of Christ in us, we find a wonderful exposition in the XIII Homily on the Epistle to the Romans. In this passage, Chrysostom emphasizes the reality of Christ's indwelling in us and of His taking possession of us. According to Chrysostom, the indwelling of Christ in us is implied by the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. But the reality of the indwelling of the latter he stresses again and again by repeating the word ἔχειν. We have, possess, the Spirit; *i.e.*, the Spirit dwells in us in reality. A striking description of the reality of this possession of the Spirit is given in the following words: Do not fear when you hear me speak of mortification (νέκρωσιν); for you possess the life really, which no death will deprive you of; for this is the life of the Spirit. The Πνεῦμα here according to the context, is the third ὑπόστασις of the Τρίας.—Ἔχεις γὰρ τὴν ὄντως ζωὴν, ἣν οὐδεὶς διαδέξεται θάνατος. Τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος.[12] Chrysostom further describes the power and dominion of the Spirit over death: He utterly destroys death, and preserves immortal what He receives—Ἀναλίσκει θάνατον καὶ δαπανᾷ, καὶ ὅπερ ἔλαβεν, ἀθάνατον διατηρεῖ.[13] To have the Spirit in us, therefore, means to be His property and to be subject to His power.

But Paul says not only, "If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you"; (Rom. VIII, 9) but also, "If Christ be in you." (v. 10) This does not mean, Chrysostom says, that the Πνεῦμα is Christ (as is frequently the case in the early patristic literature); but that he who possesses the Spirit οὐ μόνον τοῦ Χριστοῦ χρηματίζει, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει τὸν Χριστόν;[14] *i.e., not only officially wears the title of Christ, but possesses Christ Himself.* Christ's indwelling in us or our possession of Him follows from the Spirit's indwelling; it must be, therefore, real and actual, like the latter. For, says Chrysostom, it is impossible that the Spirit is present and not Christ—Οὐ γὰρ ἔστι Πνεύματος παρόντος, μὴ καὶ Χριστὸν παρεῖναι; because, wherever one of the ὑπόστασις of the Trinity is, there is the whole Trinity—πᾶσα παρέστιν ἡ Τρίας.

In this passage, then, is emphasized the reality of Christ's indwelling in us or our possession of Him, which according to Chrysostom is the effect of the "induere Christum." But he shows still more clearly that Christ's indwelling in us implies also His dominion and control over us. Among the evils that come from not possessing the Holy Spirit,—ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἔχειν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον —he mentions τὸ μὴ εἶναι ὡς χρὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτὸν ἔνοικον

[12] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 519.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] *Ibid.*

—the not belonging to Christ, as is proper, and the not having Him indwelling. On the other hand, among the blessings that come from possessing the Spirit—*ἐκ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔχειν*—he enumerates *τὸ Χριστοῦ εἶναι, τὸ αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις ἁμιλλᾶσθαι*[15] —the belonging to Christ, the possessing of Christ, the vying with the angels. It seems that Chrysostom regards the *τὸ Χριστοῦ εἶναι* and the *τὸ αὐτὸν ἔχειν τὸν Χριστὸν* as belonging together; the former being the cause of the latter. *Τὸ Χριστοῦ εἶναι*, however, means to be His *property* and to be subject to His power, so that we live for Him and He dominates us, as St. Paul says, Rom. XIV, 8: "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord. Therefore, whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's"—*τοῦ κυρίου ἐσμέν*. He continues, v. 9: "For to this end Christ died and rose again that he might dominate both the dead and the living"—*ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ*. Here Chrysostom exclaims: *Behold the absolute domination! behold the insuperable power!*—*Εἶδες δεσποτείαν ἐπιτεταμένην. Εἶδες ἰσχὺν ἄμαχον.*[16]

6. Further Explanation of "Induere Christum" and of Its Effects

Towards the end of the XXIV Homily on the Epistle to the Romans, the "induere Christum" is again explained; especially its effects are again emphasized with wonderful force and clearness and further developed. Here Chrysostom exhorts his readers to put on Christ in order to avoid all the vices he has just mentioned. That we may escape from all these (things), let us put on Christ—*τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνδυσώμεθα*, and be with Him continually—*καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ διηνεκῶς ὦμεν*.[17] Evidently these last words, which express a lasting union, are an explanation of the preceding *τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνδυσώμεθα*, and must stand in relation to it as the effect to the cause. In this passage, Christ is without doubt regarded as a power who can and will afford us protection, provided we put Him on and thereby become united to Him. The *τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνδυσώμεθα*, therefore, must mean: Let us enter into the power of Christ, let us become the property of Christ and give ourselves up to His power. In the passage before us, then, we have expressed:

a) The surrender to the power of Christ—*τὸν Χριστὸν ἐνδυσώμεθα*, which has as its immediate effect

[15] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 519.
[16] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 631.
[17] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 627.

b) A lasting union with Christ—*καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ διηνεκῶς ὦμεν*; and as a further effect

c) The protection against the evils—*ἵν' οὖν ταῦτα διαφύγωμεν ἅπαντα*. This exposition is highly illuminating and interesting.

Chrysostom immediately tells us expressly that the lasting union is included in the "induere." He says: *ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἐνδύσασθαι, τὸ μηδέποτε αὐτοῦ ἀπολειφθῆναι.*—For this is the meaning of "to have put Him on," never to be separated from Him. But he emphasizes in the same sentence another effect of the "induere": *τὸ πάντοθεν αὐτὸν φαίνεσθαι ἐν ἡμῖν,*—to exhibit Him always in us. These words express the visibility of Christ in us. He should be visible in us. We should really be what Christ is; we should be other Christs.

This visibility of Christ in us is evidently an effect of the "induere." From this we must conclude that the lasting union, too, is an effect of the "induere," for the two clauses are parallel. Through the union with Christ, which is the effect of the "induere Christum," the visibility of Christ in us is produced. Moreover, since this visibility is the effect of the "induere," it says more than mere imitation, it implies rather an assimilation to Christ.

But we may ask in what respect Christ should be visible in us. Since many things can be predicated of Him, the context or the circumstances must determine in each case the nature and the extent of this representation or assimilation. We have said that Paul's exhortation, *ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν*, in Rom. XIII, 14, refers to the acquisition or practice of virtue; and it is in this sense that Chrysostom explains the Apostle's words. He tells us that Christ should be visible in us through our sanctity and through our moderation—*διὰ τῆς ἁγιωσύνης ἡμῶν, διὰ τῆς ἐπιεικείας*. In other words, the holiness and the moderation that are Christ's should be likewise ours; we should be other Christs in holiness and moderation.

According to this important passage of Chrysostom, *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* means

a) To surrender oneself to the power of Christ, and consequently

b) To be united with Him permanently, and thereby

c) To be conformed to Him, in Rom. XIII, 14, in regard to holiness and moderation, and thus

d) To be protected against the vices, the virtues totally supplanting them.

If we compare this passage with the explanation given of "induere Christum" in the first part of this homily, we note:

a) According to both passages, "induere Christum" means

α) To give ourselves up to the possession and power of Christ, to become His property.

β) Christ exercises His power over us, uniting us to Himself intimately and permanently.

b) In the first part of the homily, Chrysostom emphasizes that the exercise of this power is owing to Christ's love.

c) In the second part of the homily, he adds a further effect of the "induere," namely, our conformity with Christ.

7. Explanation of "Induere Christum" by a Proverb

It is of great interest and importance that Chrysostom illustrates the meaning of the Pauline formula by a popular proverb. After the explanation of the "induere Christum" given above, Chrysostom continues: *Οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ φίλων λέγομεν, Ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο, τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην λέγοντες καὶ τὴν ἀδιάλειπτον συνουσίαν.*[18] So we say of friends, such a one has put on such another, meaning their great love and constant intercourse; for—so he continues—he who has put on seems to be that which he has put on—*ὁ γὰρ ἐνδυσάμενος, ἐκεῖνο φαίνεται, ὅπερ ἐνδέδυται.*

Considering the meaning given above of *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, the phrase *ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο*, when used of friends, should mean that the one gives himself up to the influence of the other and consequently becomes really his property and is both united and conformed to him. Chrysostom, however, says that the phrase expresses the strong love and the constant intercourse of friends. At first sight, it may seem that these two explanations are at variance; but they harmonize perfectly. The proverb clearly contains the three principal elements of the phrase *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, surrender to the influence of another, union, and conformity.

a) Love or friendship naturally moves a person to give himself up to the influence of his friend, so as to become his property. The influence which the latter exercises likewise is owing to his love for the former. This love and the consequent influence of the one friend over the other result in

b) Real union of the friends, and

c) Assimilation or conformity of the one to the other, so that the one is visible in the other and may be called his "alter ego."

[18] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 627.

In answer to the question, in what respect one is visible in the other, we may say that the words of Chrysostom show,—and in common parlance the circumstances will indicate,—that the conformity effected by this ἐνδύεσθαι is to be understood as a conformity in thoughts, sentiments, and even exterior habits. This second effect is included in the first and is also expressly stated by Chrysostom when he adds the ground of analogy of this proverb: For he who has put on (someone or something) appears to be that which he has put on. It is clear from this explanation that the ἐνδύεσθαι in this proverb means, to become the possession of another, to give oneself up to his power and control. Moreover, this proverb is especially well adapted to illustrate and confirm the meaning of ἐνδυέοθαι Χριστόν, since it both emphasizes the reality of our union with Christ and shows again that He exercises His power over us out of love.

8. Confirmation of the Meaning of the Proverb

The meaning of the proverb ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο and consequently also of the phrase ἐνδύεσθαι . . . Χριστόν finds a remarkable confirmation in the XIII Homily of Chrysostom on the Epistle to the Ephesians. In a moral exhortation, which he subjoins to his interpretation of St. Paul's words: "And put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth" (Eph. IV, 24), he urges his hearers to put on the garment of justice and never to put it off. To strengthen his exhortation he adds that "to put on" means nothing else than never to put off—Τὸ δὲ, ἐνδύσασθαι, οὐδὲν ἄλλο δηλοῖ, ἢ τὸ μηδέποτε ἀποθέσθαι.[19] In order to prove his statement, he cites two texts of the Psalmist, who speaks of man as having put on a curse as a garment—Ἐνεδύσατο κατάραν ὡς ἱμάτιον, καὶ ἥξει αὐτῷ[20] (Ps. CVIII, 18), and of God as having put on light as a garment—καὶ πάλιν, Ὁ περιβαλλόμενος φῶς ὡς ἱμάτιον (Ps. CIII, 2).[21] To these texts he adds: καὶ πάλιν ἡμῖν ἔθος λέγειν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο. He gives no further explanation of this phrase, but simply draws the conclusion that we should always be arrayed in virtue.

But of the text in Ps. CVIII, 18, which he quotes here as having the same meaning of ἐνδύεσθαι as our proverb, we find a further exposition in his homily on this psalm. There he shows that the phrase, "he put on a curse as a garment" implies, not only

[19] Migne, *P. G.*, 62, 97.
[20] *Ibid.*—Note the strange reading: Καὶ ἥξει αὐτῶ.
[21] *Ibid.*

a permanent union, but, in the first place, the power and control of the curse over man, its property. In verse 18, we read: "And he put on a curse as a garment, and it went in like water into his entrails, and like oil in his bones." By these words, says Chrysostom, the Psalmist indicates the strength of the blow (*τὸ σφοδρὸν τῆς πληγῆς*) and the permanence of the punishment (*τὸ μόνιμον τῆς τιμωρίας*), thereby showing that evils come to all men from themselves (*οἴκοθεν*) and from their own will (*παρὰ τῆς οικείας γνώμης*), because by their deeds and actions they repel the blessings and cast themselves headlong upon the punishments—*ταῖς δὲ τιμωρίαις ἑαυτοὺς ἐπεμβάλλουσι*. This phrase shows that the words "he put on a curse," means, he of his own accord surrendered himself to the power of the curse, he became its property.

In v. 19 of the same psalm, the idea of man's surrender to the curse is further developed. We read: "May it be unto him like a garment which covereth him: and like a girdle with which he is girded continually." In explaining these words, Chrysostom emphasizes still more the control and domination of the curse over the sinner. According to him, the Psalmist wishes to say: Thus will the evils possess and control them (*καθέξει*) that they will have no change: but they will be fastened in them (the sinners) and will remain firm, *i.e.*, the sinners will remain accursed —*ὃ δὲ λέγει τοῦτό ἐστιν· Οὕτως αὐτοὺς τὰ κακὰ καθέξει, ὡς μηδὲ μεταβολήν τινα σχεῖν· ἀλλ' ἐναποστηριχθήσεται ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ μενεῖ βέβαια.*[22] These words confirm the meaning given above of *ἐνδύεσθαι*; for they plainly show that this word expresses the surrender to the possession and control of another person or thing and consequently a permanent union and assimilation to the former.

9. Conclusion of the Exposition of the ΕΝΔΥΣΑΣΘΕ . . . ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ

After this digression, let us return to Chrysostom's explanation of *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*. Having explained the meaning and the effects of the Pauline formula by the proverb, he concludes: Let then Christ be seen in every part of us—*Φαινέθω τοίνυν πάντοθεν ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ Χριστός*.[23] The holiness and the moderation, through which, as he said above, Christ should be visible in us, should show themselves in deeds similar to those of Christ. Therefore, to his own question, how He should be seen (*πῶς φανεῖται*) he answers, If

[22] Migne, *P. G.*, 55, 263.
[23] Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 627.

thou doest His deeds—Ἂν τὰ ἐκείνου ποιῇς. Therefore, he exhorts them to imitate the example of Christ (τοῦτο καὶ σὺ ζήλωσον), which he then describes.[24]

Conclusion and Summary

According to St. John Chrysostom, ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν =

1. To surrender ourselves to the possession and dominion of Christ, to become the property and possession of Christ, who out of love for us exercises His power over us by

2. Uniting us most intimately to Himself. This union is

a) permanent "ex parte Christi,"

b) real, above all. This is the "horrendum mysterium," that, in consequence of our surrender to Him, He out of love really dwells in us and consequently really dominates our being by

3. Conforming us to Him. This conformity, as the context of St. Paul's ἐνδύσασθε . . . Χριστόν and Chrysostom's explicit explanation shows, refers here to the acquisition and practice of virtue. We should be other Christs by our holiness and moderation. Christ, who is absolutely all virtue, will help produce this effect in us.

4. This meaning of ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν is illustrated and confirmed by a popular proverb which has essentially the same meaning as the Pauline formula: to surrender to the influence of another, to become the property of another, who exercises his influence out of love; union and conformity are the effects.

5. The expression ἐνδύεσθαί τινα was quite common at least in the later κοινὴ διάλεκτος, and its meaning was well known to all.

6. According to Chrysostom, St. Paul wrote his formula in the current understanding of the common phrase ἐνδύεσθαί τινα.

It need not surprise us that Chrysostom does not say in express words ἐνδύεσθαι = to give oneself up to the power, to become the property, of some one or some thing. For the use of the expression was so common that its most elemental and essential idea was clear as daylight to all. Therefore, he explains chiefly its effects, which differ somewhat according to the circumstances in which the phrase is used and according to the nature of the person or the thing that is the object of the ἐνδύεσθαι. But from this explanation we can not escape the conclusion that the fundamental meaning of the term, according to Chrysostom, is, to become the

[24] *Ibid.*

property of, to give oneself up to the possession and dominion of another person or thing.

II. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ IN GAL. III, 27

In Chrysostom's commentary on Gal. III, 27, we have, not only a most emphatic confirmation of the explanation of *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* given in his exposition of Rom. XIII, 14, but a still more striking explanation of the problem and in addition the all-important and distinct reference to Baptism as the historical fact by which the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* is effected in the life of the Christian.

1. THE "HORRENDUM MYSTERIUM" OF ΕΝΕΔΥΣΑΣΘΕ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ

In Gal. III, 26, we read: "For you are all children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus." In these words, says Chrysostom, Paul pronounces a great and wonderful truth—*μέγα εἶπε καὶ θαυμαστόν*; and in the following verse, he explains the manner in which they became sons of God—*λέγει καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς υἱοθεσίας*. He quotes the words: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ"—*Ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε*. Then he raises the question, why we have here the expression *Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε* and not the words *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθητε* —have been begotten of God. For, he adds, the latter expression is better adapted to convey the idea that they are sons of God—*τὸ γὰρ ἀκόλουθον τοῦ δεῖξαι υἱοὺς τοῦτο ἦν*. He answers in the remarkable words: *Ὅτι πολὺ φρικωδέστερον αὐτὸ τίθησιν*. The words, you have been begotten of God, would indeed prove some kind of divine sonship of the Galatians; but Paul uses the expression *Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε* in order to express this truth in a far more awe-inspiring way.

Here we have the same word as in his exposition of the *ἐνδύσασθαι—Χριστόν* in Rom. XIII, 14. The word *φρικωδέστερον* in both passages expresses the awe (horrendum) of the mystery. The words *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, therefore, contain for Chrysostom far more of the awful and mysterious than the phrase "to be begotten of God," which would seem to be awful and mysterious enough. This again points to something more extraordinary, something far beyond the limits of anything yet heard of. What is it?

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE "HORRENDUM MYSTERIUM"

Chrysostom immediately describes the tremendous mystery: *Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδέδυσαι, τὸν Υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν*

ἑαυτῷ καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφομοιωθεὶς, εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ἰδέαν ἦχθης.[25] For, if Christ is the Son of God, and thou hast put Him on, then thou, who hast the Son within thee and hast been made like unto Him, hast been brought into one relationship and one nature with Him.[26]

This is a striking explanation of the "horrendum mysterium," Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε. In this one sentence, we have the fundamental idea of the ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν indicated and its marvelous effects clearly described. We shall begin with the latter.

The putting on of Christ (εἰ . . . σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδέδυσαι) effects in us:

a) The possessing of the Son of God in us—τὸν Υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ, or in other words the indwelling of Him in us, which, of course, implies a most intimate and real union with Christ. Being united with us, Christ

b) Conforms us to Himself—καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀφομοιωθεὶς; we become other Christs. And Chrysostom immediately adds in what respect we are conformed to Christ, in what respect we are other Christs. Here again he determines the nature of our conformity with Christ which is effected by the ἐνδύεσθαι, in accordance with the context of Paul, who wishes to show that the Galatians are sons of God. Therefore, Chrysostom adds, εἰς μίαν συγγένειαν καὶ μίαν ἰδέαν ἦχθης. Thou hast been brought into one relationship and one nature with Him.

But these blessings come to us only if we have first put on Christ—εἰ . . . σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδέδυσαι. In what does the act of the ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν which takes place in Baptism, consist? It is not expressly stated, but it can be easily inferred. Evidently here again Christ is regarded as a superior power, yes, as the highest power, the Son of God (εἰ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ), who has dominion over us and exercises it by uniting us to Him and conforming us to Him, making us sons of God on condition that we have put Him on—εἰ . . . σὺ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐνδέδυσαι. The ἐνδύεσθαι itself here can only mean to give oneself up to the power of Christ, to become His possession and to pass under His power by Baptism and consequently to partake of His nature.

Here then we have precisely the same explanation of the Pauline formula as in Chrysostom's commentary on Rom. XIII,

[25] Migne, *P. G.*, 61, 656.

[26] That ἰδέα = nature or essence is clear from its identification with μορφή in the explanation of the next verse; μορφή undoubtedly = nature, essence; see below.

14, with the exception that in this case our conformity with Christ is explained, not as an assimilation of Christ's virtues, but as a participation of His nature. In both cases, the nature of the conformity is determined by the context of the phrase.

Commenting on the following verse of the Epistle (Gal. III, 28), Chrysostom, not only emphatically repeats and elucidates our participation in Christ's nature, but adds a further effect thereof; namely, that we are all one in Christ—the Christians by Baptism become the possession of Christ so completely that they are all one in Christ. After quoting the words of St. Paul: "There is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus"—*πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*—Chrysostom exclaims in admiration of the mystery: Dost thou see the insatiable soul?—*Εἶδες ψυχὴν ἀκόρεστον.* He then explains the ground for his admiration: Paul was not content with pronouncing the great and wonderful truth: we are made children of God by faith, but he tries to find something more exact to show with greater clearness our closer oneness with Christ—*τὴν ἐγγυτέραν πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν ἕνωσιν.*[27]

Here we have the emphatic statement that the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* spells a more intimate union with Christ than the "being born of God."

But Chrysostom continues: And when he has said *αὐτὸν ἐνεδύσασθε*, he is not even content with this expression; but he explains it and penetrates more deeply into this union—*ἐνδοτέρω πρόεισι τῆς τοιαύτης συναφείας*, saying: You are all one in Christ Jesus; *i.e.*, you all have one nature, one image, namely that of Christ—*μίαν μορφὴν, ἕνα τύπον ἔχετε πάντες τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*[28]

As is undoubtedly proved by H. Schumacher,[29] the word *μορφή* in St. Paul and the Greek Fathers means the nature of a thing.[30] In this passage *μορφή* can mean only the divine nature of Christ, for the participation in His human nature is had prior to the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* and is no "horrendum mysterium."

After declaring that we have received the nature and the image of Christ, the Son of God, Chrysostom, filled with wonder and

[27] Migne, *P. G.* 61, 656.
[28] *Ibid.*
[29] *Christus in seiner Präexistenz und Kenose.*
[30] Especially when used of spiritual things this term can not mean anything but nature. Chrysostom likewise uses *μορφή* in this sense. For instance, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (II, 6), he says that the *μορφή* of the servant means the nature of man and the *μορφή* of God, the nature of God: *φύσει ἄνθρωπος, ἡ μορφὴ τοῦ δούλου—φύσει Θεὸς, καὶ ἡ μορφὴ τοῦ Θεοῦ.* (Migne, *P. G.*, 62, 220.)

awe at the greatness of this mystery, exclaims: What can be more awful (*φρικωδέστερον*) than these words? And he explains again what he understands by this "horrendum mysterium." He that was a Greek and a Jew and a slave before, now goes about having the nature, not of an angel or archangel, but of the Lord of all, and showing forth Christ in himself—*ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πάντων Δεσπότου τὴν μορφὴν ἔχων περιέρχεται, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ δεικνὺς τὸν Χριστόν.*[31] In other words, man, by putting on Christ in Baptism, becomes another Christ; he receives the nature of Christ, the Son of God and Lord of all; he becomes a son of God. This, however, is not mere figurative language, but it is a "horrendum mysterium," which points to an awful reality.

In the following verse (Gal. III, 29), Paul shows that *ἐνδύεσθαι* means to become Christ's property, to come into His possession and power. For he says, "If you are Christ's—*εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ*, then you are Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." *Χριστοῦ* is here the "genetivus possessionis" and expresses possession. But nowhere in the context does Paul say that the Galatians are Christ's property, but merely that they "put on Christ." The *εἶναι Χριστοῦ* then must follow from the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, which can only mean, to become Christ's *property*, to come into His *possession* and under His *power*.

It is of the utmost importance to note that the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, as here explained, takes place, according to Paul's express words, in Baptism. When we are baptized into Christ, he says, we become His property; we pass into His possession and under His dominion; and He exercises His power over us by giving us His *μορφή*.

3. To Be Born of God, a "Horrendum Mysterium"

According to St. John Chryostom, as we have noted above, the words *Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε* express a more awful mystery than the expression *ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθητε*. We shall be able to understand this mystery better if we compare with the exegesis given of it above Chrysostom's explanation of our birth from God. In his commentary on the words of St. John I, 12: "But as many as received Him, He gave them the power to be made sons of God," he gives a clear exposition of this grand truth; by our birth from God, he tells us, we receive the nature of God and (the impression of) His image.

[31] Migne, *P. G.* 62, 656.

First, by a long enumeration, he emphasizes the fact that all, regardless of their national or individual characteristics, were made worthy of the same honor.[32] Then he specifies the nature of this honor and mentions at the same time its cause. For the faith, he says, and the grace of the Spirit having taken away the inequality arising from worldly honors, shaped all into one nature —εἰς μίαν ἅπαντες ἔπλασε μορφήν and molded all into the one image of the King—εἰς ἕνα ἀνετύπωσε χαρακτῆρα τον βασιλικόν.

In the following passage, he tells us that to receive the μορφή and χαρακτήρ of the King means to be born of God, to be made His sons. To show more clearly the excellence of the benefit we have received and the goodness of God in bestowing it on us, he contrasts God with an earthly king, who deems it beneath his dignity to have slaves as his soldiers; but, he continues, the only begotten Son of God did not disdain to enrol publicans and magi and slaves and the most ignoble of all men,—even many who are bodily crippled and mutilated,—in the ranks of His sons—εἰς τὸν τῶν τέκνων καταλέξαι χορόν.[33]

The enrolment in the ranks of sons of God,—the receiving of the μορφή and χαρακτήρ of the King,—is not an empty and meaningless ceremony. It is not merely an external adoption, but an adoption that spells a deep and wondrous internal change in man. The nature of this change Chrysostom describes by means of a comparison and he mentions also the historic fact by which it takes place. As the nature of fire, he says, directly it comes in contact with mineral ore, immediately changes the ore into gold; in like manner, but in a far greater degree, does *Baptism* make those who are washed golden instead of earthen, for the Spirit at that time comes into our souls and consumes the image (εἰκόνα) of earth and restores the image (εἰκόνα) of heaven cast anew and brilliant and glittering, as it were, from the smelting furnace.[34]

This whole passage shows what a sublime truth our birth from God is. Elsewhere[35] Chrysostom expressly calls it a great and sublime truth (δόγμα), and its sublime character makes it a mystery. No one, he declares, can explain the manner of that wonderful generation that takes place through Baptism.[36] Although the expression "to be born of God" contains a grand and

[32] Migne, *P. G.*, 59, 75.
[33] Migne, *P. G.*, 59, 75.
[34] Migne, *P. G.*, 59, 75, 76.
[35] Migne, *P. G.*, 59, 146.
[36] *Ibid.*

awful mystery, still, says Chrysostom, the words, Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε, express something even more awful and mysterious. What is it? Both phrases, as we have seen, mean that we receive the μορφή of Christ; we become sons of God. In so far then the phrases are synonymous and equally mysterious. But the words Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε contain an additional truth not expressed in the phrase ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθητε—it is the greater oneness (ἐγγυτέρα ἕνωσις) with Christ, which is the effect of our being completely the property and possession of Christ and consists in our actual possession of Christ or His real indwelling in us (τὸν Υἱὸν ἔχων ἐν ἑαυτῷ). Herein consists the more awful mystery.

Conclusion and Summary

Summarizing the results of the explanation of ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν in Gal. III, 27, we note:

1. The "induere Christum" takes place in Baptism.

2. It is a "horrendum mysterium," which was said already in the exposition of Rom. XIII, 14.

3. This phrase expresses a more awful mystery than the words "to be born of God."

4. The "induere Christum" =

a) to give oneself up to the possession and power of Christ, to become the property of Christ, in consequence of which

b) He unites the Christian most intimately with Himself by dwelling in him,

c) He conforms the Christian to Himself by communicating to him His μορφή, by making him the son of God; therefore

d) All Christians become Christ's possession so completely that they are made εἷς in Christ; all have His μορφή.

5. What makes the Χριστόν ἐνεδύσασθε more awful and mysterious than the ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθητε, is the greater oneness—ἐγγυτέρα ἕνωσις—it effects, which is the result of our being completely the property of Christ and consists in our actually possessing Him or His real indwelling in us.

6. The expositions of ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν in Gal. III, 27, and in Rom. XIII, 14, are identical, except:

a) In Gal. III, 27, Baptism is expressly mentioned as the historical fact by which the ἐνδύεσθαι is effected.

b) In Rom. XIII, 14, love is emphasized as the reason for Christ's exercise of power over us, who are His possession.

c) In Rom. XIII, 14, the conformity with Christ, which is the effect of the ἐνδύεσθαι, regards the virtues of Christ; the Christians should be other Christs by the assimilation of His virtues, Christ should be visible in their deeds.

d) In Gal. III, 27, the conformity regards the nature of Christ; the Christians are other Christs by the participation of Christ's divine nature; they show Christ in their nature. In both cases the nature of the conformity with Christ is determined by the context in which the phrase, ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν is used.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICO-LITERARY INVESTIGATION OF ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ

We have seen how Chrysostom explains the phrase *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* and further illustrates and confirms it by the use of a Greek proverb. Of the few exegetes who take cognizance of this illustration, Zahn and Bloomfield object to it. Zahn does not positively reject Chrysostom's explanation, but merely says that the phrase used in illustration of the formula *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* by Chrysostom "gehört vielleicht einem bereits christlich gefärbten Sprachgebrauch an";[1] in other words, it is a result of a Christian tendency.

What is the truth concerning this tendency? Viewed in its true light, the existence of such a tendency does not constitute an objection to the explanation given by Chrysostom of *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, but it is rather a powerful confirmation thereof. For, if the use of the phrase *ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο*, as an expression of friendship, in the sense in which it was explained by Chrysostom, should have originated from the Pauline formula through the influence of a Christian tendency, it would be a splendid and important testimony of the understanding of St. Paul's words by the Christians of the first three centuries of our era. This testimony would be all the more decisive since this specific meaning was supposedly given to a common and well-known phrase by men who wrote and spoke the same language as the Apostle, and were, therefore, good judges of the meaning of the latter's phrase.

This interpretation of *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* is a strong confirmation of the assumption that Paul penned his words in the current meaning of the phrase *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*. For, as we have already remarked and as we shall presently show, the expression was not coined by St. Paul, but it was in vogue before his time. But the use of the phrase by the Apostle in Rom. XIII, 14, and Gal. III, 27, could hardly have been sufficient to give rise to a proverbial saying that was understood in a meaning essentially different from

[1] *Brief an d. Gal.*, 187.

that which was attached to the original phrase, and to which the people were accustomed.

Bloomfield's objection is of a more serious nature. He contends that the "common phrase" adduced by Chrysostom in explanation of the Pauline formula "is scarcely apposite."[2] The idea expressed by the proverb, he adds in his commentary to Rom. XIII, 14, "is quite different with that here meant to be inculcated by the Apostle, which only implies *imitation* of our Lord." He concludes with the remark referred to in our first chapter, that "in the numerous other passages" found in Greek literature and "cited by the Philological Commentators of *ἐνδύεσθαι, ἀποδύεσθαι,* induere, exuere, there is no more than a slight allusion to conduct considered figuratively, as a dress."[3] This is indeed a serious objection, and if it is true, then Chrysostom's interpretation of the Pauline formula is, if not positively false, at least foreign to Greek usage. Like Bloomfield, other exegetes who think the phrase of the Apostle is of Greek origin, interpret it in the sense of mere imitation of conduct. Although, as we have noted, other commentators who base their interpretation of our formula on the use of the phrase *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα,* explain the Apostle's words as denoting imitation of internal dispositions and even union, still none admit that the words express the idea of possession. What then does the history of the phrase reveal about its real meaning?

I. Meaning of ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ According to Lexicographers

If we turn to lexicographers, we can obtain no clear and definite results as to the meaning of *ἐνδύεσθαι.* According to Liddell-Scott[4] *ἐνδύω* means, 1, "to go into" and is used:

a) "of clothes," in the sense of "to put on."

b) in the meaning of to "enter, press into."—As an example of the metaphorical use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* with a personal object, these authors refer to the phrase *τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι* which means "assume (the person of) T."—2. Ἐνδύω, these authors further state, may have a casual signification, "to put on another."

Menge[5] says that *ἐνδύω* when used transitively signifies "in etw. einhüllen, jm. ein Kleid anlegen od. anziehen"; when used intransitively, however, and in the middle voice, it means:

"a) sich etwas anziehen—sich mit etw. waffnen,

"b) hinein = gehen,= schlüpfen, . . . dringen,= geraten."

[2] *Recensio synop. Annot. Sacr.,* VI, 161.
[3] *Ibid.*
[4] *Greek-Eng. Lex.,* 398.
[5] *Griech.-deutsch. Wörterbuch,* I, 238.

Pape[6] gives the same meanings of this verb as Menge. He adds several examples of the metaphorical use of the verb; when used figuratively ἐνδύω = etwas "unternehmen," "sich," etwas "unterziehen"; while the phrase τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι = "den T. anlegen, d.i., sich wie T. benehmen."

According to Benseler,[7] ἐνδύω in its figurative meaning = "eindringen, sich einlassen, sich einschleichen." In the N. T., the metaphorical use of the word signifies "sich anziehen."

The result of this brief review is not satisfactory. We see that the lexicographers as well as the exegetes do not agree with Chrysostom in explaining this important term. Who is right? And how can we solve the difficulty? The great authority of Chrysostom, who still lived in the *milieu* in which St. Paul wrote, and who was thoroughly conversant with the peculiarities of his native tongue, would go far to establish the meaning of ἐνδύεσθαι in the sense in which he explains the word. But he does not ask us to accept his interpretation merely on his authority; he himself gives us the key to a definite and certain solution of the problem. By using a Greek proverb in illustration of the Pauline formula, he not only points to the Hellenic literature as the source whence Paul derived his formula and whence he himself took his explanation of it, but at the same time he suggests the method by which we may prove the correctness of his exposition, namely by a historio-literary investigation of the term ἐνδύεσθαι. Therefore, in order to establish beyond the shadow of a doubt the meaning of Paul's phrase, we shall in the following pages examine the original meaning of ἐνδύεσθαι and trace the historical development of the phrase in Hellenic literature, paying special attention to the metaphorical use of the word as well as to its use with a personal object. In our investigation it will be of the utmost importance to note the similarities with, or the differences from, the meaning attributed to the phrase by Chrysostom. Such an investigation will set forth the meaning of Paul's words in a clearer light, and, if it results in a confirmation of Chrysostom's exposition, it will prove definitely and with certainty that his interpretation of the Apostle's words is the only correct one.

Since ἐνδύω is composed of ἐν + δύω, an inquiry into the original meaning and use of the simple component δύω-δύομαι will be eminently useful, if not absolutely necessary, in order to establish the

[6] *Handwörterbuch d. Griech. Sprache*, I, 732.
[7] *Griech.-deutsch. Schul-Wörterbuch*, 258.

precise meaning of ἐνδύω-ἐνδύομαι. For the compound is only a further development of the simple component and receives its meaning from the latter. Moreover, the letter does not create the idea; but the idea forms the letter. We may add that, according to lexicographers, the meaning and the use of δύω are similar to those of ἐνδύω. These authors agree that the literal meaning of δύω is "to enter."[8]

II. (EN)ΔΥΕΙΝ-(EN)ΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN THE HELLENIC WORLD

1. ΔΥΩ AND ΕΝΔΥΩ IN HOMER

Already in Homer we find the use of δύειν or δύεσθαι. In his epics, the word is frequently employed in its strictly literal meaning, in a naive material sense, implying a local motion of persons or bodies by which they go from one place to another and enter physically into, and are enclosed by, some thing or place. This idea is expressed, in the first place, by δύειν or δύεσθαι followed by the simple accusative of the thing or place entered. Thus Homer speaks of persons entering a city, the walls of a city, the bosom of the sea, and the earth.

For instance, Athena comes to meet Odysseus when he is about to enter the beautiful city of Scheria—ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἀρ' ἔμελλε πόλιν δύεσθαι ἐραννήν.[9]

When the parents of Hector entreat him to seek safety within the walls he refuses and says: Woe be to me! if I indeed entered within the gates and walls—ὤ μοι ἐγών, εἰ μέν κε πύλας καὶ τείχεα δύω.[10]

In *Il.* 18, 140, Thetis, the sea goddess, tells the Nereids, sea nymphs, to enter into the broad bosom of the deep—ὑμεῖς μὲν νῦν δῦτε θαλάσσης εὐρέα κόλπον.[11]

When Axylus and his attendant Calesius are killed in the battle of Troy, both enter the earth—τὼ δ' ἄμφω γαῖαν ἐδύτην.[12]

Andromache, the wife of Hector, pleads with her husband not to expose himself to the danger of death. For, she says, it were better for me to enter the earth (*i.e.*, to die) if I am to be deprived of thee—ἐμοὶ δέ κε κέρδιον εἴη σεῦ ἀφαμαρτούσῃ χθόνα δύμεναι.[13]

In Homer we also find δύειν-δύεσθαι used with the simple accusative to express the idea of clothing or arming oneself. In his

[8] Cfr. Liddell-Scott, *Greek-Eng. Lex.*, 398; Menge, *Griech.-deutsch. Wörterbuch*, I, 196.
[9] *Od.*, 7, 18.
[10] *Il.*, 22, 99.
[11] *Il.*, 18, 140.
[12] *Il.*, 6, 19.
[13] *Il.*, 6, 411.

epics, the phrase δύειν χιτῶνα,[14] and expressions like δύειν-δύεσθαι τεύχεα,[15] δύειν κυνέην,[16] or δύεσθαι νώροπα χαλκόν,[17] recur several times.

In a similar manner, Homer frequently employs δύειν-δύεσθαι to express the sinking of the stars and especially of the sun.[18] The word in this connection is apparently used absolutely, but the sea as the object is understood.[19]

Δύειν-δύεσθαι is found in Homer in its naive material sense also with the preposition εἰς or ἐς, thus expressing more emphatically the local motion by which the subject of the verb enters into the object.

The horse of Gerenian Nestor, which was shot in the head, rears in torture, for the arrow has entered the brain—*βέλος δ' εἰς ἐγκέφαλον δῦ.*[20]

Ino, after giving the shipwrecked Odysseus a wimple, wherewith he might swim safely to shore, goes back into the surging sea —*αὐτὴ δ' ἂψ ἐς πόντον ἐδύσετο κυμαίνοντα.*[21]

Again, Odysseus says that if those who have slain the kine of the Sun do not make fit atonement, he will go into Hades and shine among the dead—*δύσομαι εἰς Ἀίδαο καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω.*[22]

In the same manner, δύειν-δύεσθαι with εἰς or ἐς and ἐν or ἐνι—which originally meant the same as εἰς or ἐς—is used with regard to armor. In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, we find the expressions δύειν ἐς τεύχεα,[23] δύεσθαι ἐν τεύχεσσι[24] and ὅπλοισινἐνι δεινοῖσιν δύειν.[25]

From the foregoing examples of δύειν-δύεσθαι, used either alone or with the prepositions εἰς or ἐν, it is clear that the Greeks conceived the act of clothing or of arming oneself, expressed by δύειν-δύεσθαι, as an entering into a garment or armor.

What conclusion can we draw from the foregoing examples taken from Homer?

a) Some expressions are so colorless that from them we can not conclude anything as to the meaning of ἐνδύεσθαι. Thus, when it is said that Odysseus is about to enter the city, δύεσθαι has no

[14] *Il.*, 18, 416; *Od.*, 15, 61.
[15] *Il.*, 6, 340; 3, 328; 17, 202.
[16] *Il.*, 5, 845.
[17] *Il.*, 2, 578; 11, 16.
[18] *Il.*, 18, 241; *Od.*, 2, 388; 3, 329.
[19] Cfr. Liddell-Scott, *Op. cit.*, 398; Pape, *Op. cit.*, I, 596.
[20] *Il.*, 8, 85.
[21] *Od.*, 5, 352.
[22] *Od.*, 12, 383.
[23] *Od.*, 22, 201; 24, 498.
[24] *Od.*, 24, 496.
[25] *Il.*, 10, 254; 10, 272.

special characteristic. The idea expressed is merely the motion from one place to another, and consequently the ceasing to be in one place and the beginning to be in another. But even this is interesting enough.

b) Likewise, in the phrases—the arrow enters into the brain and Hector enters within the gates and walls, the δύειν of itself has no distinctive meaning. The fundamental idea expressed by this verb is here again the moving from one place to another, the ceasing to exist in one place and the beginning to exist in another. In both phrases, however, the idea of power is apparent. But this idea is strictly speaking not expressed in δύειν. For, in the one case, the power to wound or kill is in the arrow; and in the other, the power to protect is in the gates and the walls. Still neither the arrow nor the gates and the walls can exercise this power except through the δύειν: the arrow can not wound or kill unless it enters the body; and the gates and walls can not afford protection unless Hector gets behind them. Δύειν in these phrases seems to be connected with the idea of power in the sense of to exercise power, or to be subject to power, respectively. And this idea of power is predominant over that of motion. Likewise, it may be noted, that in these phrases δύειν expresses, not so much the idea of ceasing to be in one place and beginning to be in another, but rather the idea of ceasing to be in a certain state or condition and of beginning to be in another.

c) More characteristic are the expressions δύειν-δύεσθαι χιτῶνα, τεύχεα. Here again the basic idea is the moving from one place to another. But this idea does not stand in the foreground. Δύειν-δύεσθαι here emphasizes, not the motion from one place to another, but the action by which the person receives a new outward appearance from the object,—the garment or the armor. The question is whether such an effect on the subject (which implies the idea of the exercise of a quasi power) is intimately and permanently or only accidentally connected with δύειν-δύεσθαι and ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι. The characteristic must be noted at all events.

d) Still more distinctive are the expressions to enter the earth, the sea, Hades. Here, too, the fundamental idea is: to move from one place, not only to another, but into another; to cease to be in one place and begin to be in another; to leave the former and to be united with the latter. But something more is connoted: the "terminus ad quem" is a place that surrounds and encloses and, as it were, holds the subject, takes possession of it, and controls it.

Thus, for instance, when the Nereids enter the sea, the idea is implied that their action is modified by, and according to, the nature of the sea; they pass under its dominion.

When Axylus and Calesius are said to enter the earth, not merely the going from the one place to the other is expressed but the passing under death's dominion,—generally speaking, the passing under the dominion of something else. Consequently, here again δύειν implies, not only the ceasing to be in one place and the beginning to be in another, but the ceasing to be in one state or condition and the beginning to be in another; and this new existence is effected by the power of that which is "entered."

Especially striking is the example of Andromache. She would rather give herself up to the other place, *i.e.*, to the dominion of the earth, *i.e.*, death, than be deprived of Hector. Here a further parallel is to be noted. As before she was the property of Hector, so now she would be the property of Hades. The important question is: Is this idea of possession and power only accidentally connected with δύειν, or does a general, a permanent, connection exist between the two?

From the foregoing investigation we can draw the following conclusions:

a) The fundamental idea expressed by δύειν or δύεσθαι is the moving from one place to another and consequently

b) The ceasing to be in one place or one state and the beginning to be in another place or state; this last idea implies usually

c) The power and dominion of the subject of the verb over the object or vice versa, in consequence of which

d) The weaker element is changed; this change usually conforms the weaker element to the stronger.

e) In the foregoing examples δύειν and δύεσθαι show no difference in meaning since they are used promiscuously.

A slight development of the naive material sense of δύειν-δύεσθαι and ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι is to be noted in the following examples. Nestor tells the wounded Agamemnon, I do not counsel that we should enter the battle, for it is not meet that a wounded man should fight—*πόλεμον δ'οὐκ ἄμμε κελεύω δύμεναι· οὐ γάρ πως βεβλημένον ἔστι μαχέσθαι.*[26]

In a similar sense, Homer uses ἐνδύεσθαι or ἐσδύεσθαι. Achilles giving a prize to the aged Nestor says: Now I give thee this prize

[26] *Il.*, 14, 63.

unwon, for thou wilt not wield the cestus, nor wrestle, nor enter the javelin contest—*οὐδὲ τ'ἀκοντισὺν ἐσδύσεαι.*[27]

In these examples, *δύειν* and *ἐσδύεσθαι* or *ἐνδύεσθαι* are used, not in their most strictly literal meaning, implying physical entrance of the subject into an object by which it is enveloped, but in the sense of participating in. We have here the first visible progress from the naive material expression. In the former example, "to enter the battle" is evidently equivalent to the phrase "to fight"; whereas "to enter a contest" means the same as "to contend." Now, if a person takes part in a battle or contest he

a) Goes from one place to another, and consequently he

b) Ceases to be in the place and state in which he was and begins to be in a new state or condition. This implies

c) A surrendering of the subject to the power and control of the object,

d) A change in the subject according to the task and the requirements of the object.

It is worthy of note that, in proportion as the strictly literal meaning of *δύειν-δύεσθαι* and *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* is lost, the idea of power and possession projects itself. The question here is again: Are the self-surrender of the subject to the power of the object and the former's consequent change only accidentally connected with the verb? Here we note that the II aorist active is used like the middle in the sense, "to give oneself up to the power of."

In Homer we, moreover, find *δύεσθαι* followed by *εἰς* and a personal object. Here again the giving up of oneself to the superior power of another is strongly emphasized. In a battle against the Trojans, Teucer, the archer, takes his stand beneath the shield of Ajax. Ajax stealthily withdraws the shield and Teucer spies his chance; and when he has shot and hit one of the enemy, he returns, and as a child behind its mother, he enters into Ajax, who hides him with his shining shield—

αὐτὰρ ὁ αὖτις ἰὼν πάις ὣς ὑπὸ μητέρα δύσκεν
εἰς Αἴανθ'· ὁ δέ μιν σάκει κρύπτασκε φανεινῷ.[28]

In the phrase *δύσκεν εἰς Αἴανθ'* there is evidently expressed:

a) The going from one place to another;

b) Union with the new place; Teucer gets as closely as possible to Ajax; this implies further the

c) Surrender to the power of Ajax, which has as its effect the

[27] *Il.*, 23, 622. Some edtions have *ἐνδύσεαι.*
[28] *Il.*, 8, 271-272.

d) Protection of Teucer.

e) Teucer not only ceases to be in one place and begins to be in another place, but he also begins to be in a new state or condition, namely, of protection, which again is the result of his coming under the power of Ajax.

f) The picture of the child running behind its mother may suggest the confident surrender of Teucer to the power of Ajax. But this is only a picture, and that specific idea may not be expressed in *ἐνδύεσθαι*.

The question again presents itself: Is the idea of possession and power here only accidentally connected with *δύειν-δύεσθαι* and *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* or do these words themselves imply it? The fact that the words always appear in the same complex of ideas suggests that these ideas are inherent in them.

A further development of *δύειν-δύεσθαι* and *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* is found in the expressions in which Homer speaks of dispositions and passions as entering into man. Menge and Pape, in their dictionaries, mark these phrases as examples of the metaphorical use of the respective words.

Athena is said to allow the haughty suitors of Odysseus's wife to give free vent to their biting scorn, for she wishes greater pain to enter the heart of Odysseus—*ὄφρ' ἔτι μᾶλλον δύῃ ἄχος κραδίην Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος.*[29]

Again, when Achilles looks at the armor Thetis has brought to him, still greater fury enters into him—*ὡς εἶδ', ὅς μιν μᾶλλον ἔδυ χόλος.*[30]

Another example: Odysseus tells Achilles that Hector does not reverence at all either men or gods, but that great madness has entered into him—*κρατερὴ δέ ἑ λύσσα δέδυκεν.*[31]

These examples are remarkable. The predominant feature is that these passions take possession of man; although the expression "to take possession" is not used, still a proper analysis of the text demands this interpretation. In these examples, *δύειν* is a strong and emphatic word that expresses:

a) The moving from one place to another, and especially

b) The possession and control of the passion over the person, which has as its effect

c) The change of the person in conformity with the passion.

[29] *Od.*, 18, 347-348.
[30] *Il.*, 19, 16.
[31] *Il.*, 9, 239.

In some of the examples, this change is then described. Since in these examples the passions are regarded as the stronger and consequently controlling factor, δύειν here means to take possession of and not to surrender to the power of.

The idea of the control and possession of man by the passion is brought out with surprising clearness and force in the following example, which is found in the fifth book of the *Iliad,* v. 811-812. Athena tells Tydeus that she stands beside him and guards him and with all her heart bids him fight the Trojans; yet, she adds: Either weariness of much striving has entered into thy limbs, or at least disheartening terror has taken hold of thee—

ἀλλά σευ ἢ κάματος πολυᾶιξ γυῖα δέδυκεν,
ἤ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον.

Here we have the solution of the mysterious meaning of δύειν-δύεσθαι and ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι by the identification of δύειν with ἴσχειν. Δύειν in these contexts means to take possession. Besides, it is clear from this passage that the idea of possession and control expressed in the preceding examples is, not merely accidentally, but permanently and essentially connected with δύειν-δύεσθαι. This result is of the greatest importance.

Also in *Iliad,* ἐνδύειν is used to express the possession and control of man by a passion. In this example, however, ἐν is separated from δύειν by tmesis. Homer describes the distress of Achilles over the death of Patroclus. Into his heart, he says, intolerable anguish has entered—ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ δῦν' ἄχος ἄτλητον.[32]

A striking example of the use of δύειν in the sense of taking possession is found in the seventeenth book of the *Iliad* (v. 210-212). When Hector puts on the armor of Patroclus, Ares, the dread war god, enters into him, *i.e.,* takes possession of him, and his limbs are filled with valor and strength—δῦ δέ μιν Ἄρης δεινὸς ἐνυάλιος, πλῆσθεν δ' ἄρ οἱ μέλε' ἐντὸς ἀλκῆς καὶ σθένεος.

Perhaps such an example can be fully understood only in the light of ancient mythological and demonological views. The ancients not only regarded concrete material objects as deities, but even conceived the various dispositions that affect man for good or for evil as good or bad demons, which enter physically into man and operate in him. "Was den Menschen plagt und ängstigt," says Dieterich, "was ihn verunreinigt und hemmt, sind böse

[32] *Il.,* 19, 366-367. Damm, however, takes ἦτορ to be the subject, and renders the phrase "induebat dolorem, quasi gravem vestem aut grave spiculum"; cfr. *Nov. Lex., Graec.,* I. The phrase in either case implies possession.

Dämonen, die materiell an und in ihm sitzen; was er leistet, handelt, was ihn treibt und stärkt, sind gute Dämonen, die in ihm wohnen und wirken. Durch die Leibesöffnungen," he continues, "gehen sie ein und aus, werden herein-und herausgezwungen, werden zitiert und ausgetrieben." In these words the author briefly characterizes this primitive belief, which, he says, we find among all "Naturvölkern," and which still survives "in festgewordenen z.T. abgegriffenen Bildern bei allen Kulturvölkern, ohne dass sie noch ins Bewusstsein treten."[33]

This view gives us a powerful illustration of the development of δύειν-δύεσθαι and ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι from its naive material sense to its metaphorical meaning. For originally madness, fury, and the like, were conceived also by the Greeks as demons that entered physically into man and dominated him. Later when this belief no longer prevailed, the same expression was preserved but taken metaphorically.

In the examples cited above, dispositions and passions are conceived as entering into man. It is of great interest and importance to note that Homer reverses this expression and speaks of man as entering into dispositions or qualities. An example of this latter phrase is found in the *Iliad*. Odysseus tells Achilles, who out of wrath against Agamemnon has refused to fight, that the Greeks dread a very great disaster at the hands of the Trojans. Now it is doubtful, he says, whether we shall save the well-benched ships or behold them perish, if thou enterest not into valor—εἰ μὴ σύ γε δύσεαι ἀλκήν.[34] This expression, like the phrase "madness entered Hector," which occurs in the same passage, undoubtedly implies domination and control of the person by the respective passion. An apparent difficulty is created by the difference in the grammatical construction of the two phrases. In the expression "madness entered Hector," the object is possessed and controlled by the subject; whereas in the phrase "Achilles should enter into valor," the subject is represented as being in the possession and under the control of the object. This difficulty can be easily solved. For in both cases, as the law of language itself demands, the verb describes the action of the subject. Accordingly, in the former phrase, madness is described as taking possession and gaining control of Hector; while in the latter expression, Achilles himself gives himself up to the possession and domination of

[33] *Mithrasliturgie*, 98-99.
[34] *Il.*, 9, 231.

valor. In the one case, then, the passion takes control; in the other, the person passes under the control of the passion.

It is to be noted that in the examples suggesting possession and control of man by passion, the active voice is used; whereas, in the last example, in which the verb means that man gives himself up to the control of might, the middle is used. This seems to point to the probability that the Greek mind knew of a distinction between the meanings here expressed by the active and the middle. We have to keep this in mind for our investigation to find out whether this supposition holds good.

To sum up, the phrase under discussion clearly expresses:

a) The moving of Achilles from one place to another, or rather

b) The ceasing to be in one state or condition and the entering into another condition, which includes

c) The giving over of himself by Achilles to the possession and power of valor, and consequently

d) A change in Achilles effected by, and according to, the object—valor; he should be, as it were, the personification of valor.

Since Homer uses *δύειν-δύεσθαι* of man in connection with armor and garments, which not only envelop, but, as it were, give their form to the person that "enters into" them, it would seem that Homer derived this metaphorical expression from the figure of a garment. This assumption acquires greater probability from Homer's use of the cognate expression *ἔννυσθαι* or *ἐπιέννυσθαι ἀλκήν*. Thus he describes the Ajaces as clothed with impetuous valor—*Αἴαντες θοῦριν ἐπιειμένοι ἀλκήν*.[35] Likewise he says the heart of Achilles is clothed with valor—*'Αχιλεὺς—φρεσὶν εἰμένος ἀλκήν*.[36]

It will hardly be denied that the words *ἔννυσθαι* or *ἐπιέννυσθαι ἀλκήν* are equivalent to the phrase *δύεσθαι ἀλκήν*. *Ἔννυσθαι* or *ἐπιέννυσθαι* means, in the first place, to clothe, to envelop. The conception of valor in the expression "Achilles should enter into valor," as a garment, accords perfectly with the explanation we have given. For, if a person enters into a garment, he not only moves, as it were, from one place to another, but he freely gives himself over to the quasi possession of the garment, which changes his outward appearance.

Having investigated in detail the use and the meaning of *δύειν-δύεσθαι* and *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* in Homer, we shall now proceed to

[35] *Il.*, 8, 262.
[36] *Il.*, 20, 381. Compare the expressions in *Il.*, 1, 149: *ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένε.*

examine the meaning and the use of these words in later authors. In our investigation, we shall pay special attention to such phrases as may throw further light on the original meaning of ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι and on its historical development, especially in a figurative sense.

2. Metaphorical Use of ΔΥΕΙΝ in Aeschylus

In Aeschylus's (b. 525) *Agamemnon*, 228, we note an example of the metaphorical use of δύειν. The chorus relates how Agamemnon, after some hesitation, finally decides to yield to the demand of Artemis and sacrifice his daughter in order not to disappoint his allies. His yielding to this bitter alternative is expressed by the phrase—δ'ἀνάγκας ἔδυ λέπαδνον.[37] Necessity is here conceived as a yoke that controls Agamemnon and determines his course of action. Moreover, in this phrase Agamemnon is the subject. Consequently he is described as giving himself over to the power of the necessity of sacrificing his own daughter, for he is free to accept the other alternative. The effect of this surrender is, of course the sacrificing of his daughter. Here the II aorist is used in the sense, to enter into, to give oneself up to the power of. Perhaps the active expresses that Agamemnon is free to submit to the yoke or not.—In this example we have

a) The ceasing to be in one state and the entering into another, which implies,

b) The surrender of Agamemnon to the possession and power of necessity, and

c) The consequent change in Agamemnon effected by, and in conformity with, this necessity.

3. ΔΥΕΙΝ-ΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ and its Compounds in Herodotus

Like Homer, Herodotus (b. 484) uses δύειν in its naive material sense. In his *Historiae* VIII, he speaks of an expert diver (δύτης) who dives into the sea—δὺς ἐς τὴν θάλασσαν.[38]

Likewise, we find ἐσδύεσθαι, or rather ἐσδύνειν, used by Herodotus in its strictly literal sense. We may remark here that already in this author the compounds ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι and especially ἐσδύειν-ἐσδύεσθαι occur more frequently than in Homer. Describing the cultivation of palm trees in Babylonia, he says the natives tie the fruit of the so-called male palms to the branches of the date-

[37] *Agam.*, 228 (Al. 217).
[38] *Hist.*, VIII, 8, 2.

bearing palms, to let the gall-fly enter the date—ὁ ψὴν τὴν βάλανον ἐσδύνων.[39]

He uses ἐσδύειν also absolutely with the object understood. Speaking of the robbery of an Egyptian king's treasury, he says that one of the thieves entered in (ἐσδύντος τοῦ ἑτέρου αὐτῶν),[40] and that, when he was caught in a trap, he ordered his brother to enter in as quickly as possible (τὴν ταχίστην ἐσδύντα)[41] and to cut off his head.

Herodotus employs ἐνδύειν, not only in connection with garments,[42] as is the case with Homer, but also with armor—ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι τὰ ὅπλα.[43]

In the *Historiae* II there occurs a phrase that deserves special attention. Here we find ἐσδύνειν and ἐσδύεσθαι used in their naive material sense, but in connection with the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. The Egyptians, says our historian, were also the first to broach the opinion that the soul of man is immortal, and that, when the body dies, the soul always enters into the form of another animal, which then comes into being—τοῦ σώματος δὲ καταφθίνοντος ἐς ἄλλο ζῷον αἰεὶ γινόμενον ἐσδύεται,[44] until it has circled through the forms of all the creatures which tenant the earth, the water, and the air, after which it enters again into a human body, which then comes into being—αὖτις ἐς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα γινόμενον ἐσδύνειν.[45] It may be observed in this example that the middle of ἐσδύειν is used synonymously with the active of ἐσδύνειν.

The phrase "the soul enters the body" undoubtedly expresses a moving from one place to another which results in an intimate union between the soul and the body. Here, too, the idea of possession is implied. As we have seen, in Homer δύειν-δύεσθαι may mean either to take possession of or to surrender to the possession and power of; so the expression before us may be interpreted to signify: the soul gives itself up to the possession and power of the body or the soul takes possession of the body, according as the body or the soul is regarded as the stronger principle. Which idea is conveyed here, can not be determined with absolute certainty; but, if the notion of the Egyptians concerning the nature of the relation between the body and the soul was the same as

[39] *Hist.*, I, 193, 5.
[40] *Hist.*, II, 121, 2.
[41] *Ibid.*
[42] *Hist.*, II, 81, 1; VII, 64; II, 42, 4 and 6.
[43] *Hist.*, I, 172, 2; VII, 218, 1.
[44] *Hist.*, II, 123, 2.
[45] *Ibid.*

that of the Greek metempsychosists, especially Pythagoras and Plato,[46] who, as Herodotus says, borrowed the doctrine of the transmigration of souls from the Egyptians,[47] then the phrase means: the *soul gives itself up* to the *possession* and *power* of the body. In consequence of its entering into the body, the soul not only gives life to it but also ceases to be in one state or condition and begins to be in a new state. It not only receives a new mode of existence, but it is variously affected by, and according to, the nature of the body to which it is united.

This example is the more interesting as we see such a striking parallel to the texts of St. Paul we are investigating. In both cases, the general frame in which the ἐνδύεσθαι or ἐσδύνειν-ἐσδύεσθαι occurs is the regeneration; and in both cases the subject of the verb loses one mode of existence and enters on a new one, becomes subject to the power of the object of the ἐνδύεσθαι, and is changed by, and in conformity with, it. It is important to note the essential elements connected with ἐσδύνειν-ἐσδύεσθαι in the phrase before us:

a) The moving from one place to another.
b) The surrender to the possession and power of the body and
c) The consequent change in the life of the soul; this implies
d) The ceasing to be in one state and entering on another.
e) The new life of the soul may be styled a regeneration.

As Homer uses δύειν-δύεσθαι and ἐνδύειν, so Herodotus employs ἐσδύνειν figuratively of passions that enter and take possession of man. The historian tells us that, when the Pelasgians learned that the sons of their Athenian concubines took concerted action against the sons of their Pelasgian wives, they consulted together and on considering the matter terror entered—καί σφι βουλευομένοισι δεινόν τι ἐσέδυνε,[48] *i.e.*, took possession of them. Here ἐσδύνειν is used in the same sense as ἐσδύειν.

4. ΔΥΕΙΝ, ΕΙΣΔΥΕΙΝ AND ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ IN SOPHOCLES

Like Homer and Herodotus, Sophocles (b. 496) uses δύειν in its naive material sense. The chorus says of Ajax, who committed suicide: O that he had ere this entered into the vast ether or the common Hades—ὄφελε πρότερον αἰθέρα δῦναι μέγαν ἢ τὸν πολύκοινον Ἀίδαν.[49] This phrase includes the idea of possession and

[46] They considered the body as the prison of the soul.
[47] *Hist.*, II, 123, 2.
[48] *Hist.*, VI, 138, 3.
[49] *Ajax*, 1192-1193.

power. But since Hades is deemed the stronger, the dominating factor, the meaning is not Ajax took possession of Hades, but gave himself up to the realm, the possession and power of Hades.

Ἐνδύειν is employed by Sophocles in connection with garments. It seems that already at his time ἐνδύειν was the commonly accepted compound of δύειν. In the *Trachiniae,* the playwright speaks of a garment which poisoned Heracles who put it on—ὃν κεῖνος ἐνδύς.[50] This example is interesting, since it indicates clearly that, by entering into the garment, Heracles gave himself up to the power of the poison of the garment, which exercised its sinister effect on him. The exercise of the power of poisoning is here only accidentally connected with ἐνδύειν; but it is important to note that ἐνδύειν is used to express such accidental features together with its own essential meaning—to pass under the possession and power of. Note the use of the II aorist active in this and the preceding example.

Finally, Sophocles, like Homer and Herodotus, speaks of dispositions as entering man and taking possession of him. He, however, uses εἰσδύειν to express this figure. When Oedipus Tyrannus discovers that he has killed his father and married his mother, he pierces his own eyes. Thereupon, he exclaims, How both the sting of the points and the memory of the evils entered me together—οἷον—εἰσέδυ μ' ἅμα κέντρων τε τῶδ' οἴστρημα καὶ μνήμη κακῶν.[51] This exclamation of pain, not only expresses the mere entering of the sting of the points and the memory of the evils, but implies that the one as well as the other exercises a power over him, the power of torturing. This twofold idea is fully expressed by the phrase "they took possession of him."—In the two foregoing examples the II aorist active = to give oneself up to the possession of; here it = to take possession of.

5. ΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ, ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ, AND ΕΙΣΔΥΕΙΝ IN EURIPIDES

Also this tragedian (b. 480) employs δύεσθαι and εἰσδύειν in their strictly literal sense. Thus in *Electra,* Castor says the Furies enter into the earth's abyss—χάσμα δύσονται χθονός.[52]

Again, we read that, when Iphigenia is sacrificed, no one knows whither she has gone—οὔ γῆς εἰσέδυ.[53]

[50] *Trach.,* 759.
[51] *Oed. T.,* 1317-1318.
[52] *Electra,* 1271.
[53] *Iphig. A.,* 1583.

Also in Euripides we find *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* used in connection with garments. In the *Bacchantes* he speaks of Pentheus putting on woman's clothes—*θῆλυν ἐνδῦναι*[54] and *ἐνδύσεται*.[55] The purpose of putting on this disguise was that he might observe unnoticed the orgies of the bacchant women. As we have already remarked, *δύειν-δύεσθαι* or *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι*, when used in connection with garments, emphasizes, not the motion of going from one place to another, but the action by which the person receives a new outward appearance. This implies that the person gives himself up to the quasi possession of the garment. These ideas are more clearly expressed in the example before us. For surely, when a man puts on a garment of a woman he gives himself up to the quasi possession of the garment, which changes his outward appearance; he receives the outward appearance of a woman.

It is likewise noteworthy that Euripides speaks of the *σαρκὸς ἐνδυτά*,[56] *i.e.*, that into which the flesh has entered, meaning the skin. The *σάρξ* is, as it were, the property of the skin, which envelopes and holds it and gives it a new outward appearance.

6. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN ARISTOPHANES

This dramatist (b.c. 448) uses *ἐνδύειν*,[57] *ἐνδύεσθαι*,[58] not only in its literal meaning with garment as its object, but also *ἐνδύεσθαι* in a metaphorical sense. In *Ecclesiazusae* we read of a plot formed by some women of Athens to attend the public meeting under the guise of old men and vote a change in government. Their action is referred to in the words—*ἐνδυόμεναι—τόλημα τηλικοῦντοι*,[59] entering into such a daring scheme. Here the scheme is regarded as a power to which they give themselves over, and which consequently governs and controls their actions. The middle is used to denote the surrender to the possession and power of something.

A still more curious example of the metaphorical use of *ἐνδύειν* is found in *Vespae*. At the end of the third act, the chorus sings the praises of the author of the play. He, they sing, imitating the art of divination used by Eurycles, has entered into the "ventres" of others and poured forth from there many a comical jest—*εἰς ἀλλοτρίας γαστέρας ἐνδὺς κωμῳδικὰ πολλὰ χέασθαι*.[60] This expression

[54] *Bacc.*, 836, cfr. also 852.
[55] *Bacc.*, 853.
[56] *Bacc.*, 746-747.
[57] *Thes.*, 1044; *Lys*, 1021.
[58] *Thes.*, 253.
[59] *Ecc.*, 287-288.
[60] *Vesp.*, 1020.

evidently implies possession and control. For, as it was believed that a spirit entered and took possession of soothsayers like Eurycles and poured forth his ideas through the soothsayer's lips,[61] so the poet describes himself as having entered into the "venter" of the players—taken possession of them—and as having consequently poured forth his wit and humor from their lips. In this figurative phrase there are expressed most clearly:

a) The moving from one place to another;

b) The possession and control of the object, which implies

c) Union, and effects

d) A change in the object in conformity to the possessor. The players speak the words and imitate the actions of the playwright.—Here the II aorist active is again used to express the taking possession of.

It is of interest to remember Chrysostom's interpretation of the Pauline formula. He has the same exegesis of possession but significantly in the inverted order. What is more important, however, is that he calls our becoming the possession of Christ a "mysterium horrendum." Certainly no one would think of a "mysterium horrendum" in Aristophanes's example, since his words are not to be taken literally. The reason for the appellation "mysterium horrendum" in Chrysostom's interpretation is the fact that the expression *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* is to be understood in its literal and real signification. In the light of this passage, especially when it is considered in connection with all the preceding examples, the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* of St. Paul would find its final solution.

7. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ AND ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN XENOPHON

In Xenophon (b.c. 434) we find the active voice *ἐνδύειν* used in the causative sense of to clothe someone with a garment.[62]

It is more important to note several examples of the figurative use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* by this author. One of the leaders of the allies of Cyrus asks the king to address their troops, since his words would enter deepest into the minds of the hearers—*λόγοι οὗτοι καὶ μάλιστα ἐνδύονται ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν ἀκουόντων.*[63] *Ἐνδύονται* here seems to be a passive form, and it means: the words are entered into by the souls, *i.e.*, the souls give themselves up to the power and influence of Cyrus's words.

[61] Cfr. Rogers, *The Wasps*, 152.
[62] *Cyr.*, I, III, 3.
[63] *Cyr.*, II, I, 13.

We have in Xenophon another example of the metaphorical use of ἐνδύειν. He tells us that Cyrus entered into the care—ἐνέδυ μὲν—εἰς ταύτην τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν,[64] of providing the best possible men for the most important offices in his realm. The care is here conceived as a duty, a power to which Cyrus surrenders himself, and which in turn regulates his actions.

8. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN PLATO

As Herodotus uses ἐνδύειν and ἐνδύεσθαι, so Plato employs the middle of ἐνδύειν in connection with the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. In *Phaedo*[65] he teaches that the souls of the wicked are compelled to flit about the tombs until, through the desire of the corporeal which clings to them, they are again imprisoned in a body—ἐνδεθῶσιν εἰς σῶμα,—and they are likely to be imprisoned in natures (ἐνδοῦνται δὲ, ὥσπερ εἰκὸς, εἰς—ἤθη) which correspond to the practice of their former life. Thus, those who have indulged in gluttony and violence and drunkenness are likely to enter into the species of asses and similar beasts—εἰς τὰ τῶν ὄνων γένη καὶ τοιούτων θηρίων εἰκὸς ἐνδύεσθαι; while those that have practiced injustice and tyranny and robbery go into, εἰς—ἰέναι, the species of wolves and hawks and kites and the like. Evidently in this example ἐνδύεσθαι εἰς is used synonymously with ἐνδεῖσθαι εἰς, which means to be imprisoned in, and with ἰέναι εἰς, which simply expresses the moving from one place to another. Ἐνδύεσθαι and ἰέναι receive their most emphatic interpretation from ἐνδεῖσθαι. For the phrase, to be imprisoned, includes the idea to be subject to a controlling and dominating power, which here is the nature of the beasts into which the soul enters or to whose power the soul gives itself up. In consequence of this imprisonment, the soul receives a new mode of existence and is variously changed according to the nature of the prison.[66]

[64] *Cyr.*, VIII, I, 12.
[65] *Phaedo*, XXXI.
[66] It may be of interest to quote a few words from Zeller relative to Plato's idea concerning the relation between the body and the soul: "Erhebliche Schwierigkeiten macht endlich auch das Verhältniss der Seele zum Körper. Einerseits soll sie in ihrem Wesen so durchaus verschieden und in ihrem Dasein so unabhängig von ihm sein, dass sie ohne ihn existiet hat und dereinst wieder ohne ihn zu existieren bestimmt ist, ja sie soll nur dann einen vollkommeneren, ihrer wahren Natur entsprechenden Lebenszustand erreichen, wenn sie die Fesseln des Körpers abgestreift hat. Anderseits aber soll dieser ihr so fremdartige Leib einen so störenden Einfluss auf sie ausüben dass sie von ihm in den Strom des Werdens herabgezogen in Irrthum verseucht, mit Unruhe und Verwirrung erfüllt, durch Leidenschaften und Begierden, durch Sorgen, Furcht, Einbildungen trunken gemacht wird; die stürmischen Wogen des körperlichen Lebens sollen ihren

In the *Respublica,* Plato uses ἐνδύεσθαι with the simple accusative in the same sense. A certain Erus, who has returned from Hades, relates that he saw the soul of the buffoon Thersites entering into an ape—ἰδεῖν τὴν τοῦ γελωτοποιοῦ Θερσίτου (ψυχὴν) πίθηκον ἐνδυομένην,[67] *i.e.,* becoming the possession of an ape.

Equally interesting are the examples of ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι used in a figurative sense. Plato speaks of an image entering man, and conversely of man or the mind of man entering an object.

In the *Respublica* II, XVII, the philosopher treats of the education of the citizens. Especially when the mind is young and tender is the image which we wish to imprint on each individual formed and enters in—μάλιστα γὰρ δὴ τότε πλάττεται καὶ ἐνδύεται τύπος, ὃν ἄν τις βούληται ἐνσημήνασθαι ἑκάστῳ.[68] In this phrase, ἐνδύεται seems to be the passive form and to mean that the soul submits more easily to the possession and control of the τύπος, by which and conformably to which it is consequently molded.[69]

Again, Plato speaks of the mind entering into its object. He tells us that only he is competent to judge the relative happiness of the just and the unjust man who is not struck with the outward pomp of a tyrant, but who is able by reflection to enter into and see through the nature of man—ὃς δύναται τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰς ἀνδρὸς ἦθος ἐνδὺς διδεῖν.[70] Not merely the figurative entering into the nature of some one else is here expressed, but also the exercise of the power of the subject that enters. In the previous examples we saw that the power implied by the ἐνδύεσθαι is exercised in shaping the object into something else. Here, however, by the ἐνδύειν it is merely stated that the intellect exercises its power, namely the power to scrutinize; but this connotes that it subjects the object to its scrutinizing power. The phrase then supposes an intellectual

ewigen Kreislauf zerrütten und aufhalten; beim Eintritt in den Körper soll sie den Trank der Vergessenheit geschlürft, sollen such die Anschauungen ihres früheren Daseins bis zur Unkenntlichkeit verwischt haben; von ihrer Verbindung mit dem Körper soll jene ganze Verunstaltung ihres Wesens herrühren, die Plato mit so lebhaften Farben ausmalt." After mentioning other influences of the body on the soul, he concludes: "Von so durchgreifender Bedeutung ist das körperliche Leben, in seinem Anfang wie in seinem Fortgang, für den Geist. Wie sich aber diess mit Plato's anderweitigen Annahmen vertragen soll, lässt sich allerdings nicht absehen. Cfr. *Philosophie Der Griechen,* II., 1, 855-859.

[67] *Resp.,* X, XVI.

[68] *Resp.,* II, XVII.

[69] Plato in *Leg.* I, XI, speaks of kind feeling taking possession of children. But, since the correct reading of the Greek text is uncertain, the mere reference to this example suffices.

[70] *Resp.,* IX, IV.

domination over the secret and mysterious ways of the human heart; an intellectual possession.[71]

In *Cratylus* ἐνδύειν occurs in the sense of to clothe, but with a figurative connotation. Plato is discussing the derivation of names. When he is asked by Hermogenes to give the etymology of the names of various virtues, he replies that, since he has entered into the lion's skin—ἐπειδήπερ τὴν λεοντῆν ἐνδέδυκα,[72] it is proper for him, not to shrink from the task, but to examine those names. The phrase ἐνδύεται τὴν λεοντῆν, as we learn from Gregory of Constantinople,[73] was a familiar proverbial expression with the Greeks, and, according to Apostolius,[74] it was applied to those who "magna aggrediuntur." In our text, Plato seems to mean that, since he has made bold to give the etymology of other words, he should not shrink from an attempt to comply with the request of Hermogenes.

We have here a figure taken from the idea of putting on a garment. And what the phrase, to enter a garment, intimates, this figure clearly expresses; namely, to give oneself up to the influence or control of that which the garment represents—in our case, courage. The words then mean to enter into the possession of courage, to be possessed by courage. The effect of being thus possessed is Plato's attempt to explain the names. In the figure of a garment then we have:

a) The surrender to the possession of that for which the garment stands, which implies

b) A union, and effects

c) A change in the subject in accordance with that for which the garment stands.—It is strange that in this figure the perfect of the active is used synonymously with the middle.

9. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN ARISTOTLE

Aristotle (b. 384) objects to those philosophers who indeed admit that the soul is united to the body, but who do not determine further the relation of the body to the soul, just as if it were possible, as the Pythagorean fables say, that any soul can enter any body—τὴν τυχοῦσαν ψυχὴν εἰς τὸ τυχὸν ἐνδύεσθαι σῶμα.[75] This idea is

[71] This idea of possession is well expressed by our slang phrase "I got you."

[72] *Crat.*, XXVI.

[73] Migne, *P. G.*, 142, 456 D.

[74] *Ibid.*

[75] *Anima*, I, III.

just as ridiculous as if some one would say that the carpenter's art could enter into pipes—*τὴν τεκτονικὴν εἰς αὐλοὺς ἐνδύεσθαι.*[76] For, he concludes, just as an art must use (*χρῆσθαι*) its (corresponding) instruments, so must the soul use the body, *i.e.*, must have such a body as is adapted to its use. *Ἐνδύεσθαι*, in the first phrase, means that the proper soul be possessed by the proper body. This meaning is evident from the example that follows, which says that the carpenter's art can not be possessed by pipes.

10. The Metaphor ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ TINA in Dionysius

In *Ant. Rom.*, XI, V, of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (b.c. 54 B.C.) we note an example of the metaphorical use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* followed by a personal object. This citation deserves special attention, not only on account of its close similarity with the phrase of St. Paul, but especially because it has again and again been quoted and referred to by exegetes as a proof that *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* means nothing more than imitation. It is also this example that Bloomfield has in mind when he says that, in the passages cited by commentators of *ἐνδύεσθαι*, "there is no more than a slight allusion to conduct considered figuratively, as a dress."[77]

The important expression in question is found in a description of a meeting of the Roman senate. When Valerius was speaking, Appius and the rest of the decemviri sprang up and prevented him from continuing. A great noise ensued. Finally Marcus Horatius, no longer able to restrain his anger, addressed Appius and his associates: Very quickly do you force me, Appius, to rend the bridles in twain, since you are no longer moderate but put on that Tarquin—*οὐκέτι μετριάζοντες, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι*;[78] for you do not allow those to say a word who wish to speak in behalf of the common welfare. What is the precise meaning of the phrase *τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι*?

We have seen that, in the Greek literature from Homer down to Dionysius, *ἐνδύεσθαι* implies, in the first place, possession. We have further seen that he who is possessed, or becomes the possession, of another thing, is changed according to the possessor.

If then we wish to interpret the words of Dionysius in accordance with the unanimous testimony of the Greek writers, we must say that the fundamental idea implied in this phrase is possession.

[76] *Ibid.*
[77] *Recensio synop. Annot. Sacr.*, VI, 160.
[78] *Ant. Rom.*, XI, V, 2.

To exclude this idea and to interpret the words merely in the sense of to imitate is to establish an exception which is unwarranted.

Moreover, with this interpretation the context of our passage is in perfect agreement. Appius and his associates have, so to say, surrendered to the possession and power of Tarquin, are so possessed by Tarquin that they are changed according to him; they become, as it were, other Tarquins. Since the context clearly shows that, in consequence of this possession, Appius and his associates are changed or conformed to Tarquin and not vice versa, the words *τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι* evidently mean to surrender to the possession of Tarquin, or to let oneself be possessed by Tarquin, and not to take possession of Tarquin.

The context, moreover, tells us precisely how Appius and his comrades are changed: they receive the qualities of Tarquin; namely, his intolerance and arrogance. By receiving these qualities, they are made quasi Tarquins. Horatius tells us this when he adds: For you do not allow those to say a word who wish to speak in behalf of the common welfare.

The circumstance that the context gives us the key to the precise interpretation of the phrase *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*, for determining not only the subject of the possession, but also the precise nature of its effects, is most important, yet it seems to be not generally recognized by commentators.

Since in this phrase the effect of the possession is explicitly described, commentators conclude that external imitation, or assumption of the qualities of another, is the primary and only idea contained in the word *ἐνδύεσθαι* both in this instance and in all others in which it is used. Imitation is certainly included in this phrase. But to render the expression by "you are imitating that Tarquin" is to emasculate it. The fundamental and dominating idea would be better expressed by "you are possessed, you are bewitched by Tarquin." That Appius and his associates consequently act like Tarquin, is only the result of the possession which forms the fundamental idea. And this effect is more than mere imitation. It is conceived as being effected by Tarquin; he, his power, is conceived as acting in them.

Finally, from the fact that Dionysius represents Horatius as speaking these words in ordinary conversation, yes in a heated debate, we must infer that this metaphorical expression was a common and popular phrase.

This example of the use of ἐνδύεσθαι with a personal object is certainly most remarkable and bears a striking similarity to St. Paul's expression. But neither to this example can we apply the words of Chrysostom, "mysterium horrendum," for here we evidently have a metaphorical use of ἐνδύεσθαι. Appius and his comrades are not actually possessed and changed by Tarquin. Certainly Chrysostom saw in St. Paul's use of the same phrase more than is expressed here. This additional meaning, as we have seen, consists in the reality of Christ's possession of us; we are actually His property and He actually dwells in us and conforms us to Himself. There is no question that here we have the key to the solution of the Pauline formula.

11. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN PHILO

In the *De Mundo* IV of Philo (b. 25 B.C.), we meet with a strange use of ἐνδύεσθαι. Speaking of the specific differences between the various classes of creatures, he says that of the bodies some enter into habit, and others nature, and others soul, and others a rational soul—τῶν σωμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐνεδύσατο ἕξιν, τὰ δὲ φύσιν, τὰ δὲ ψυχὴν, τὰ δὲ λογικὴν ψυχήν.[79] Evidently, in this citation, ἐνδύεσθαι can not mean to enter. For Philo immediately describes habit (ἕξιν) which one class of bodies ἐνεδύσατο, not as enclosing the bodies, but as being enclosed by them.[80] In the same manner, he conceives the soul to be enclosed in the body as in a prison.[81] Ἐνδύεσθαι, then, in this case, does not mean to enter, but it implies the idea of possession. But does Philo mean that the bodies take possession of or become the possession of habit, etc.? The latter is evidently his meaning, for the change that is effected in the possessed is here predicated of the bodies. Thus through their union with a φύσις or ψυχή, as Philo explains,[82] bodies become plants or animals or men, respectively.

12. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN JOSEPHUS

This author (b. 37 A.D.) uses the word only in its literal signification with clothing[83] and armor[84] as its object. In *Antiq.* XIX, 1, 5, he speaks of the Emperor Cajus who put on woman's clothes —στολὰς γὰρ ἐνδυόμενος γυναικείας. He did this, adds Josephus, to

[79] *Opera.* II, 606.
[80] *Ibid.*
[81] Cfr. also Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen,* III, 2, 448.
[82] *Opera.* II, 606 ff.
[83] *Antiq.,* XVII, 5, 7; XVIII, 4, 3; etc.
[84] *Bel. Jud.,* V, 5, 7.

make the company mistake him for a woman. As we have already remarked,[85] when a man puts on the garment of a woman he gives himself up to the quasi possession of the garment, and consequently is changed by it; he receives the outward appearance of a woman.

13. Metaphorical Use of ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ by Christian Writers

In the first age of the Christian era, we repeatedly find ἐνδύεσθαι used in a figurative sense by the Christian writers.

a) *St. Clement of Rome*

The first example we wish to adduce is found in the (first) letter of St. Clement of Rome, which was written in the last decade of the first century of our era.[86] In the third chapter, the author exhorts his readers to cleave to those to whom grace is given from God and to enter into concord—ἐνδυσώμεθα τὴν ὁμόνοιαν.[87] At the same time he points out the manner in which it should manifest itself in them: being lowly-minded and temperate, holding ourselves aloof from all backbiting and evil speaking, being justified by works and not by words.[88] The words ἐνδυσώμεθα τὴν ὁμόνοιαν, which are similar to Homer's phrase δύεσθαι ἀλκήν, clearly mean: let us enter into the possession of concord, let us be possessed by concord, and thereby assume its qualities, *i.e.*, become truly harmonious.

b) *St. Ignatius*

In his letter to St. Polycarp, written between 98 and 117,[89] this holy martyr exhorts his friend by the grace wherewith he is clothed παρακαλῶ σε ἐν χάριτι ᾗ ἐνδέδυσαι,[90] to press forward in his course and to exhort all men that they may be saved. Ἐνδύεσθαι in this expression, as in the words of St. Clement, can not mean to enter physically into, for grace is not about us but in us. The natural meaning of the phrase is that Polycarp has become the possession of grace, that he has been possessed and transformed by it.

c) *Shepherd of Hermas*

In the *Shepherd of Hermas* (written between 140 and 155),[91] the metaphorical use of ἐνδύεσθαι as an expression denoting the

[85] *Bel. Jud.*, V, 5, 7.
[86] Cfr. Bardenhewer, *Patrol.*, 27.
[87] Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 21.
[88] Lightfoot, *Op. cit.*, 70.
[89] Cfr. Bardenhewer, *Patrol.*, 30.
[90] Lightfoot, *Op. cit.*, 131.
[91] Cfr. Bardenhewer, *Patrol.*, 40.

entrance into the possession of various virtues and vices and other qualities, is quite frequent. He speaks of entering into (*ἐνδύεσθαι*) the faith of the Lord,[92] justice,[93] reverence,[94] long-suffering,[95] truth,[96] good and holy desire,[97] cheerfulness,[98] strength,[99] as also much folly,[100] and great pride.[101] A good desire he also designates as an *ἔνδυμα*.[102]

In the above-mentioned phrases, *ἐνδύεσθαι* can not have its strictly literal meaning of to enter; for all the qualities mentioned are conceived as being in man, penetrating and affecting his very nature. The words can only mean that man surrenders himself to the possession and control of these qualities, and consequently assumes the nature and the qualities of the possessor. To convince ourselves that this is the meaning of the phrase, we need only examine an example.

In the 3. Vision, a young man appears to Hermas and relates the following parable. An old man, who has lost all hope in himself by reason of his weakness and his poverty, and who is waiting only for the last day of his life, suddenly receives an inheritance. He hears the news, rises, and full of joy enters into strength—*ἐνεδύσατο τὴν ἰσχύν*, and no longer lies down, but stands up, and his spirit, which was broken by reason of his former condition, is renewed again, and he no longer sits, but takes courage.[103] Strength is here conceived as a power that came from without and took possession of the old man. The phrase *ἐνεδύσατο τὴν ἰσχύν* then means: he was possessed by strength, and received the qualities of his possessor, *i.e.*, he became strong, as the vision says, he no longer lies down, and his broken spirit is renewed. The possessing power inaugurates a restoration and renovation.

14. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ AND ΑΠΟΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN LUCIAN

We now come to an example which has been adduced by a few exegetes to explain the Pauline formula. The phrase occurs in Lucian's (b.c. 120 A.D.) *Gallus* 19, and reads, *ἀποδυσάμενος δὲ τὸν*

[92] *V.*, 4, I, 8; *M.*, 9, 7; *M.*, 9, 10; *S.*, 6, I, 2.
[93] *M.*, 2; *S.*, 6, I, 4.
[94] *M.*, 2, 4.
[95] *M.*, 5, II, 8.
[96] *M.*, 11, 4.
[97] *M.*, 12, I, 1.
[98] *M.*, 10, III, 1 and 4.
[99] *V.*, 3, XII, 2.
[100] *S.*, 6, V, 3.
[101] *S.*, 8, IX, 1.
[102] *M.*, 12, I, 2.
[103] Cfr. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 418.

Πυθαγόραν τίνας μετημφιάσω μετ' αὐτόν. According to Schleusner,[104] this ἀποδύεσθαι is the contrary of ἐνδύεσθαι used in the sense of to imitate the "naturam et mores" of some one. Similarly, Olshausen[105] regards it as an example of ἀποδύεσθαι in the meaning of "fashioning oneself unlike—a person." Barnes[106] gives a curious translation and explanation of this expression. According to him Lucian says "having received him as a teacher and guide." Although Bloomfield[107] mentions no particular passage, still he most probably has this example in mind when he says that in the passages cited by commentators of ἀποδύεσθαι—"exuere," "there is no more than a slight allusion to conduct considered figuratively, as a dress." And this example should then serve as a confirmation or proof of his assertion that the explanation of ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν in Rom. XIII, 14, by St. John Chrysostom "is scarcely apposite."

But let us examine the context of Lucian's phrase. In a dialogue between a cobbler, named Micyllus, and a cock, the latter at his master's request explains the various transmigrations he has undergone, how his soul, coming from Apollo to the earth, entered into the body of a man—ἡ ψυχή μοι—ἐνέδυ εἰς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα,[108] how he became Euphorbus, and how, after a lapse of time, he came into Pythagoras ἐς Πυθαγόραν ἦκον.[109] When the cock has related several incidents from his life as Pythagoras, Micyllus asks him: Ἀποδυσάμενος δὲ τὸν Πυθαγόραν τίνας μετημφιάσω μετ' αὐτόν.[110] To this question the cock answers: Ἀσπασίαν τὴν ἐκ Μιλήτου ἑταίραν. Micyllus rejoins: Φεῦ τοῦ λόγου, καὶ γυνὴ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁ Πυθαγόρας ἐγένετο.[111]

It is inconceivable how any one who has only superficially read this passage and noted its context, can say that ἀποδύεσθαι here refers to imitation. It is evident that the phrase must be interpreted in the light of what precedes and follows; namely, in the light of the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and it clearly means to go out of.

It is likewise strange that the phrase ἐνέδυ εἰς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα, which occurs in the same context, has been entirely overlooked by commentators.

[104] *Nov. Lex. Graeco—Lat in N. T.*, I, 631.
[105] *Bib. Comm. on Rom.*, 404.
[106] *Notes on Rom.*, 322.
[107] *Recensio synop. Annot. Sacr.*, VI, 161.
[108] *Gall.*, 16.
[109] *Gall.*, 17.
[110] *Gall.*, 19.
[111] *Ibid.*

This latter phrase is evidently synonymous with the expression that occurs a few lines later, *ἐς Πυθαγόραν ἦκον*—I came into Pythagoras. *Ἐνδύειν*, accordingly, implies the union of the soul with the body; and *ἀποδύεσθαι*, its opposite, the disunion, the separation of the soul from the body—and not imitation. But the *ἐνδύειν* here implies more than mere union; it expresses a qualified union. Like the *ἐσδύνειν-ἐσδύεσθαι* found in Herodotus and the *ἐνδύεσθαι* in Plato, *ἐνδύειν* here means that the soul becomes the possession of the body and is changed by it. In other words, the soul by its entrance into the body loses its former mode of existence and receives a new mode of being; yes, it is here represented as becoming that into which it enters. Thus, when the soul of the cock enters the body of Euphorbus, it becomes Euphorbus (*Εὔφορβος ἐγενόμην*);[112] when it enters the body of Aspasia, it is transformed (*μετημφιάσω*) into Aspasia and becomes a woman (*γυνὴ—ἐγένετο*).[113] Note here again the II aorist used in the sense of the middle.

If *ἐνέδυ* here means: the soul became the possession of the body, then *ἀποδυσάμενος τὸν Πυθαγόραν* must mean: having left the possession of Pythagoras, *i.e.*, of his body, having been freed from its control and dominion.[114]

15. The Metaphor ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΤΙΝΑ in Eusebius

In the introduction of Eusebius's (b. 265 A.D.) *Life of Constantine*, we find an excellent example of the metaphor *ἐνδύεσθαί τινα*, which, however, has apparently not been adduced in explanation of the Pauline formula, except by Gataker.[115]

In the beginning of his introduction, the historian declares that whithersoever he gazes, whether to the east or to the west or at the whole world or towards heaven itself, everywhere he sees the blessed king present to his kingdom. His sons, he continues, I see as new lights of the earth, filling the universe with his rays, and him (I see) living by his power and governing the life of all together better than before, being multiplied by the succession of his children; for heretofore they shared indeed the honor of Emperors, but now they have entered into their father wholly—*οἱ Καισάρων μὲν ἔτι πρότερον μετεῖχον τιμῆς, νυνὶ δ' ὅλον αὐτὸν ἐνδυσάμενοι.*[116]

[112] *Gall.*, 16.
[113] *Gall.*, 19.
[114] *Gall.*, 20.
[115] *Opera*, 226.
[116] Migne, *P. G.*, 20, 911 B.

This expression is very similar to the phrase, to enter into Tarquin, found in the *Ant. Rom.* of Dionysius, and, like it, it implies possession and dominion. The sons of Constantine, Eusebius wishes to say, have, as it were, completely surrendered themselves to the possession of their father; they are completely possessed by him, and are consequently changed according to him; they have become, so to say, other Constantines. The context tells in what respect the sons are controlled by their father, so that they have become other Constantines. It is by the acquisition of his qualities. Eusebius says they were wholly possessed by their father, so that they showed themselves as emperors both by their virtue of religion and by upholding the glorious institutions of their fathers—*δ'ὅλον αὐτὸν ἐνδυσάμενοι, θεοσεβείας ἀρετῇ αὐτοκράτορες, Αὔγουστοι, σεβαστοὶ, βασιλεῖς, τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς ἐμπρέποντες καλλωπίσμασιν, ἀνεδείχθησαν.*[117] So pronounced is their conformity or identity with their father through this acquisition of his qualities in the eyes of Eusebius that he continues: I see him living by his power and governing all better than before.

It is clear that in this example not mere imitation is expressed. Constantine or his virtues are here conceived as a power that is actually working in the sons and conforming them wholly to itself.

It is highly interesting to compare this metaphorical use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* with the meaning of the word in its literal sense; as, for instance, in the examples taken from the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. In both cases *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* implies possession and dominion, and consequently a change in the object controlled. It ceases to be in one place, or rather in one state or condition, and begins to be in another. This change is effected both by and according to the possessor. The important difference between the two examples is this: In the literal phrase, the dominating factor actually and physically possesses, controls, and changes the other; whereas in the metaphorical expression of Eusebius, the dominating element is merely conceived as possessing, controlling, and changing the other.

16. The Metaphor ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ ΤΙΝΑ in Libanius

The last example we shall adduce is contained in a letter of Libanius (b.c. 314 A.D.) to Alcibiades. Libanius, having heard that Firminus, his former pupil, has given up military life and

[117] *Ibid.*

devoted himself to literary pursuits, writes to Alcibiades: Indeed, if you had given me all your goods (*οὐσίαν*) and likewise those of your relatives and friends, you would not have given me more than what has been given to me now. For what gift could ever appear to be greater than the present one, or even its equal. Then he says what he understands by this great gift: *Φιρμῖνον ῥίψας τὸν στρατιώτην ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν.*[118]

Cremer[119] explains this phrase as meaning "'den Sophisten spielen,' sich verhalten, sich geben, darstellen als wäre man u.s.w." Accordingly he thinks it is "völlig verfehlt" to seek to explain the Pauline formula by this example or that taken from Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It is difficult to see how the phrase *ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν*, as it is used by Libanius, means merely "'den Sophisten spielen,' sich—darstellen als wäre man u.s.w." For the context clearly indicates that the phrase means he really became a sophist, a rhetor, and not only mimicked a sophist. In the first place, Firminus was a soldier; but he gave up this avocation and *ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν*. The evident meaning is, he adopted the profession of a sophist, he became a real sophist, giving up his former profession. Moreover, how could Libanius call the news concerning Firminus the greatest gift he could receive, if Firminus was only posing as a sophist?

The words Libanius adds immediately in explanation of the phrase *ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν* bear out our contention. He says: There is a chair suited to him, and there are benches and books, and young men are being educated, and speeches are being worked out and delivered which stir up his educated audience. In these words, Libanius depicts the activities of a true rhetorician. The context then clearly shows that the phrase *ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν* means Firminus became a real sophist; that, in other words, he was changed according to the object of the verb, or that he ceased to be in one state and began to be in another.

But is this change the fundamental idea of the phrase or only its effect? If this expression is interpreted in the light of the meaning of *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* discovered in other examples, both literal and figurative, it means that Firminus gave himself up to the determining power of sophism, and in consequence of this surrender he was changed into a sophist. The context, too, seems to suggest this interpretation. For Firminus was a soldier by

[118] *Ep., ed. Wolf*, 452.
[119] *Bib.-theol. Wörterbuch d. neut. Gräc.*, 378.

profession, but he threw off the soldier—*ῥίψας τὸν στρατιώτην*, and entered into the sophist—*ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν*. These metaphorical expressions can be taken to mean that he freed himself from the occupation of a soldier and gave himself up to the occupation of a sophist. As in his military occupation he was under the power of military discipline, so in his sophistic occupation he is under the power of sophism. He is subject to its regulations and influences. He belongs to the school of sophists; they call him their own. Here the idea of possession, power, and control is apparent. In this example, we again have the II aorist active used in the sense of the middle.

Summary and Valuation

We may now summarize the results of our historical literary investigation.

1. The principal outstanding result is that in all the examples investigated the idea of possession and power is connected with *(ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι*.

2. When used in their naive material sense, these verbs = to move from one place to another, the place to which one moves is a place of domination. This implies the ceasing to be in one place and the beginning to be in another.

3. In their more developed literal sense, as also in their figurative meaning, they express:

a) Possession and dominion, and as its effect a

b) Change in the possessed by and in accordance with the possessor. This implies that the possessed ceases to be in one state or condition and begins to be in another.

4. a) The active voice (except in the II aorist) = to take possession. The only exceptions to this rule, besides Homer's phrase *πύλας καὶ τείχεα δύω*, is the use of these verbs by earlier writers with garments and arms as object, and the figure of Plato which is derived from the idea of putting on a garment, *τὴν λεοντῆν ἐνδέδυκα*. Later, however, this proverbial figure is likewise expressed by the middle.

N. B. *ἐσδύνειν*, with the *ν*, is used by Herodotus in the sense of to take possession of and to surrender to the possession of.

b) The middle voice always = to surrender to the possession and dominion of, to become the property and possession of.

c) The II aorist active *(ἐν)έδυν* = to take possession, and to surrender to the possession of. When used in the latter

sense, it seems to emphasize the general meaning of the active, *i.e.*, to bring out the free will of the agent.

5. The context always clearly tells us which is the precise meaning of the verb:

a) If the subject is the stronger element and the change is effected in the object, it = to take possession and control of.

b) If the object is the stronger element and the change is effected in the subject, it = to surrender to the possession and power of, to become the property of.

6. The context tells us also the precise nature of the change. Where the change is made by and according to a person, it means a change according to what the person stands for in the context.

7. When (ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι is used in a metaphorical sense, the possession is not real but only imagined, and the change, though real, is conceived as being made by the possessor.

8. In the κοινὴ period ἐνδύεσθαι is used in a stereotyped form, according to which the object is the stronger element and the change is wrought in the subject, and = to give oneself up to the possession and power of, to become the property of.

9. The possession connotes union. Indeed, in some cases, the effect of the possession is described as an identity of the possessed with the possessor.

10. The change that results from the possession implies imitation; imitation, however, is not the fundamental idea contained in (ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι, but only its effect, nor should it be styled mere imitation, but rather assimilation.

11. (Ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι, as used in the philosophical system of the Greeks to express the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, is most characteristic and interesting, for here

a) (Ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι is taken in its literal meaning;

b) It effects a union, a oneness of the possessor and the possessed.

c) The further effect of the (ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι is a kind of παλιγγενεσία, a new mode of life for the possessed.

III. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN BIBLICAL LITERATURE

The question now arises whether the same meaning and use attach to ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι in the Biblical as in the profane Greek literature, and, in any case, whether Paul in his formula followed either of these literary currents. Since Paul is known to follow his own ways, the meaning of ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι in Biblical literature

can not of itself prove decisive for the interpretation of the ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν in the Pauline epistles. But, in so far as the Biblical Greek writings should agree with the profane Greek literature as to the meaning and use of ἐνδύεσθαι, they would seem to be a striking illustration and powerful confirmation of the results attained from the latter source.

1. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN THE LXX

a) Use of Ἐνδύειν-Ἐνδύεσθαι with an Impersonal Object

The term occurs more than 110 times in the LXX, and in almost every case where it has a Hebrew equivalent it is the rendering of one or the other form of the verb לבשׁ, which properly means to put on, to clothe.[120] More than 60 times this word is used in its literal, naive material sense and is followed by the accusative of garment, or in a causative sense with the accusative of person and garment or only of person. In all these cases, except three, ἐνδύεσθαι is the equivalent of the Hebrew לבשׁ. In 2 Kings VI, 14, it stands for חגר = to gird, to surround;[121] in Lev. VIII, 7, it is the translation of נתן = to give;[122] while in Ez. XLIV, 17, it is the rendering of עלה = to go up, to ascend,[123] In these three cases, ἐνδύεσθαι is merely a free rendering of the Hebrew.

Besides its frequent use with garment, ἐνδύεσθαι is found four times in the LXX in the sense of to put on a breastplate. Likewise here, where it has a Hebrew equivalent, it is the equation of לבשׁ.

Like the expressions ἐνδύεσθαι χιτῶνα-τεύχεα found in profane Greek literature, all these phrases may imply that the person gives himself up to the quasi influence of the garment or armor, and consequently is changed by and according to it, *i.e.*, receives from it a new outward appearance.

In some instances in which ἐνδύεσθαι-לבשׁ is used in its literal sense with garment as its object, we find garment modified by a word that denotes a disposition or quality. Thus, before Judith went to the camp of Holofernes, she put off the garments of her widowhood and put on the garments of her gladness—ἐνεδύσατο τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς εὐφροσύνης αὐτῆς.[124] There is no Hebrew equivalent for

[120] Cfr. Gesenius, *Hebr. u. Aram. Handwörterbuch*, 402.
[121] Gesenius, *Op. cit.*, 233.
[122] Gesenius, *Op. cit.*, 522.
[123] Gesenius, *Op. cit.*, 612.
[124] Jud. X, 3.

this phrase. In this expression, the symbolic signification of the word garment predominates.

Again, in relating the acts of penance and humiliation Esther performed before appearing before the king with her plea in behalf of the Jewish people, the text says that, when she had laid aside the garments of her glory, she put on the garments of distress and grief—*ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτια στενοχωρίας καὶ πένθους.*[125] Here, too, we have no Hebrew equivalent. Although this expression, like the preceding, is to be taken literally, still it emphasizes the symbolic signification of the garments.

A similar example is contained in Isaias. Describing the joy of the Messias he says: "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, and my soul shall be joyful in my God. For he hath clothed me with the garments of salvation and with the robe of justice"—*ἐνέδυσε γάρ με ἱμάτιον σωτηρίου καὶ χιτῶνα εὐφροσύνης.*[126] The Hebrew has: כִּי הִלְבִּישַׁנִי בִּגְדֵי־יֶשַׁע מְעִיל צְדָקָה יְעָטָנִי. This phrase is not only symbolic, but also metaphorical. By metonomy, the "garments of salvation" here stand for "salvation" itself. It is important to note here that to put on the garment of something is the same as to put on the thing itself. The active is here used in a causative sense. The notion of possession always connected with *ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι* has a very interesting meaning here; it emphasizes that the being possessed by salvation is the gift of God. It means: God has caused me to be possessed by salvation.

The figurative phrase, to put on the garment of a certain disposition, is less frequently met than the metaphorical expression, to put on a disposition as a garment. Thus we find the expressions: to put on a curse as a garment—*ἐνεδύσατο κατάραν ὡς ἱμάτιον*;[127] Hebrew—וַיִּלְבַּשׁ קְלָלָה כִּמְדוֹ; to put on wisdom as a robe of glory—*στολὴν δόξης ἐνδύσῃ αὐτήν*;[128] to put on justice as a long robe of honor—*ἐνδύσῃ αὐτὸ ὡς ποδήρη δόξης.*[129] We also have the phrase, to put on justice as a breastplate—*ἐνεδύσατο δικαιοσύνην ὡς θώρακα*;[130] Hebrew—וַיִּלְבַּשׁ צֶדֶק כַּשִּׁרְיָן. These phrases mean to be possessed and dominated by these qualities. This idea is consistently expressed in the Greek by the middle. The expression "he put on curse as a garment" is further developed in the

[125] Est. XIV, 2.
[126] Is. LXI, 10.
[127] Ps. CVIII, 18.
[128] Eccli. VI, 32.
[129] Eccli. XXVII, 9.
[130] Is. LIX, 17, Cfr. also Wisdom V, 19.

text by the Psalmist, and it is the most plastic and illustrative use of ἐνδύεσθαι we have seen so far. The text reads: "And he loved the curse, and it shall come unto him: and he would not have blessing, and it shall be far from him." He loved the curse means, of course, that he loved evil, which brings the curse, so to say, automatically. The text continues, καὶ ἐνεδύσατο κατάραν ὡς ἱμάτιον —"and he put on cursing like a garment," *i.e.*, he became subject to its power, "and it went in like water into his entrails, and like oil in his bones. May it be unto him like a garment that covereth him: and like a girdle with which he is girded continually." These expressions seem to imply that in this figure of a garment is contained also the idea of the completeness, the totality of the possession. This same notion is also suggested by the phrase "long robe of honor," ποδήρη, which completely covers the body.

Likewise, the text "thou shalt put her (wisdom) on as a robe of glory"[131] is very interesting when considered in the light of its context. Wisdom is described as a mighty power that holds and controls those who give themselves up to its possession. In Eccli. VI, 25, the inspired writer says, "Put thy feet into her fetters, and thy neck into her chains. 26: Bow down thy shoulder, and bear her: and be not grieved with her bands. 30: Then (*i.e.*, in the latter end) shall her fetters be a strong defense for thee and a firm foundation and her chain a robe of glory. 31: For in her is the beauty of life: and her bands are a healthful binding." Here then follows our text: στολὴν δόξης ἐνδύσῃ αὐτήν. This phrase not only means thou shalt pass under her power, but it implies that your surrender to her will redound to your own glory.

Finally, ἐνδύεσθαι is used figuratively of a disposition or quality. Thus, power[132] and strength,[133] praise[134] and beauty,[135] justice[136] and salvation,[137] likewise confusion[138] and shame[139] and sorrow[140] are said to be put on. This manner of expression, which logically belongs to the more developed stage of the language, is very similar in form and contents to the phrase of Homer δύεσθαι ἀλκήν and to the expressions of the early Christian writers who use ἐνδύεσθαι

[131] Eccli. VI, 32.
[132] Ps. XCII, 1.
[133] Prov. XXXI, 25; Is. LI, 9; Is. LII, 1.
[134] Ps. CIII, 1.
[135] Ps. CXII, 1; Ps. CIII, 1; Prov. XXXI, 25.
[136] Ps. CXXXI, 9.
[137] 2 Para. VI, 41; Ps. CXXXI, 16.
[138] Job VIII, 22; Ps. CXXXI, 18.
[139] Ps. XXXIV, 26.
[140] Ez. VII, 27.

of a disposition. Like these phrases, the figurative expressions in the LXX can be most naturally understood as meaning to give oneself over to the possession and power of the respective disposition or quality, which in turn conforms the subject to it, so that the latter can be said to have the quality.

Another example of לבשׁ, which is rather surprising. The Hebrew text of Ps. LXIV, 14, reads: לָבְשׁוּ כָרִים הַצֹּאן = "the pastures clothe themselves with the cattle or sheep." Because כָּרִים in its first sense means sheep, the LXX translates this passage: Ἐνεδύσαντο οἱ κρίοι τῶν προβάτων = the rams of the flock were clothed. This translation is incorrect, for כָּרִים is not in the construct but in the absolute state. The meaning of the Hebrew text seems to be: The pastures are possessed by the cattle or sheep. But לָבְשׁוּ here implies more than mere possession. This expression is probably derived from the figure of a garment and the "tertium comparationis" very likely is the totality of the covering. The sheep are so numerous that they cover the whole field. Here again then the completeness, the totality of the possession is emphasized.

b) Use of Ἐνδύειν-Ἐνδύεσθαι with a Personal Object

It is of interest to note that in the O. T. ἐνδύειν-לבשׁ is used with a personal object. In three of these examples, the Spirit of God is said to put on some one. Thus, in Judges VI, 34, we read that πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐνέδυσε τὸν Γεδεών[141] = וְרוּחַ יְהוָה לָבְשָׁה אֶת־גִּדְעוֹן. This phrase means that the Spirit of the Lord entered into Gedeon, took possession of him, and consequently ruled his actions, as the context shows. The text continues, "And he sounded the trumpet and called together the house of Abiezer, to follow him," etc. These actions are the result of the Spirit's possession. The phrase "the Spirit of the Lord possessed Gedeon" is similar to the expressions found in the profane Greek literature, which declare that fury, pain, madness, and similar qualities enter man and take possession of him. But here the phrase seems to have its literal meaning: the Spirit of the Lord literally entered into Gedeon and took possession of him. It is important to note, however, that this phrase, like the Greek, implies, first, possession and control; second, a change in the possessed.—The aorist active ἐνέδυσε again is used to denote the taking possession of man by the Spirit.

[141] A and B have: πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐνεδυνάμωσε τον Γεδεών.

Another example. When David, who had fled from Saul, doubted in what spirit the men of Benjamin and of Juda came to him, the Spirit "put on" Amasai: *καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνέδυσε τὸν Αμασαί*[142]= וְרוּחַ לָבְשָׁה אֶת־עֲמָשַׂי. Here again the I aorist active *ἐνέδυσε* is used and means that the Spirit took possession of Amasai and dominated him. The effects of this possession are the words of reassurance Amasai spoke to David.

Finally, when the princes of Juda, who after the death of Joiada worshiped idols, would not listen to the prophets that were sent to bring them back to the Lord, the Spirit of God put on Zacharias: *καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐνέδυσε τὸν Ἀζαρίαν.*[143] Also here *ἐνέδυσε* equates the Hebrew לָבְשָׁה It has the same meaning as in the preceding examples. The effects of the possession of Zacharias by the Spirit are the words of reproach that the prophet thereupon speaks to the princes.

A confirmation of this interpretation of לבשׁ is found in the Syriac, the sister language of the Hebrew. For the first metaphorical meaning of the Syriac equivalent *lebash* is to invade, occupy, obsess.[144] The variant reading of B in the first passage, and of A in the first and second passages is not opposed to this interpretation. For *ἐνδυναμόω*—to strengthen, surely implies the exercise of a power.

In Isaias XLIX, 18, we have another example of the use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* with a personal object. The prophet says of Sion: "Lift up thy eyes round about and see. And these are gathered together, they are come to thee. I live, saith the Lord, that thou shalt be clothed with all these as with an ornament"—*ὅτι πάντας αὐτοὺς ὡς κόσμον ἐνδύσῃ*—"and as a bride thou shalt put them about thee"—*περιθήσεις αὐτούς*. For *ἐνδύσῃ* the Hebrew has the Qal form of לבשׁ: תִּלְבָּשִׁי In this example, the middle is used and = thou shalt be possessed by all these; but the emphasis seems to be on the fulness or totality of the possession, which is expressed by לבשׁ and by the words "all these." Moreover, the phrase also expresses that the possession redounds to the glory of Sion, "as an ornament."

[142] 1 Para. XII, 18. Here A, but not B, renders לָבְשָׁה by *ἐνεδυνάμωσεν*.

[143] 2 Para. XXIV, 20. In this passage neither A nor B has a different reading.

[144] Cfr. Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, 1879.

Summary and Valuation

We may now summarize the results of our Septuagintal investigation and compare them with the results obtained from our study of the Hellenic writers:

1. In the LXX, as in the profane Greek literature, the idea of possession and power is always connected with ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι.

2. In the LXX, a strict distinction between the active and the middle voice is observed throughout:

a) The active: ἐνδύειν always = to take possession;

b) The middle: ἐνδύεσθαι invariably = to become the property of; to surrender to the control and possession of. The II aorist active is never used.

3. In the profane Greek literature, but not in the LXX, ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι is used in its primary local meaning, to go into a place.

4. In both literatures, ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι is used in its literal meaning with garment or armor as its object.

5. In the O. T., however, the symbolic meaning is often in the foreground, even when the phrase is taken literally; *e.g.,* Esther put on the garments of distress and grief.

6. When used figuratively in the O. T., ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι often emphasizes:

a) The symbolic element; *e.g.,* to put on the garments of salvation.

b) The totality of possession; *e.g.,* to put on a curse as a garment.

7. In both the profane Greek literature and the LXX, ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι is used of various dispositions and qualities, and it implies the possession and domination of the person by the disposition. But the grammatical structure of the phrase is different in the two literatures:

a) In the earlier Greek writers, the disposition or quality is the subject, and ἐνδύειν is used in the sense to take possession of;

b) In the LXX, as in the one phrase of Homer δύεσθαι ἀλκήν and in the early Christian writers, the person is the subject and the middle ἐνδύεσθαι is employed, meaning to give oneself over to the possession and power of.

8. In both literatures, ἐνδύεσθαι is used with a personal subject and object. In the LXX, we have the example: the Spirit of the Lord put on some one. Here the active [illegible] is used and means: to take possession of. In the profane Greek writings, however, espe-

cially in the κοινή period, the middle ἐνδύεσθαι is used, in this connection, and means: to surrender to the possession of, to become the property of. In the LXX, the phrases here referred to may be taken in their literal sense; whereas in the Greek writings, they are undoubtedly metaphorical.

We see then from this summary that the use of ἐνδύεσθαι in the profane Greek writings is noticeably different from that in the LXX, and especially that only in the former do we find an exact parallel to the formula of Paul ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν. Yet, in both literatures, the fundamental and essential idea of ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι is the same; it involves possession and dominion, which imply a change in the possessed by and according to the possessor.

2. ΕΝΔΥΕΙΝ-ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

a) In non-Pauline Writings

In the N. T. writers, St. Paul excluded, the word occurs thirteen times. In all these cases, except one, ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι is used in its literal meaning with garment as its object.

St. Luke is the only N. T. writer, besides St. Paul, who uses the term in a figurative sense. He thus renders Christ's last words to the Apostles before His Ascension: "And I send the promise of my Father upon you"—ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ'ὑμᾶς, "stay you in the city" ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν[145] —which in the light of our investigation means: till you have entered into the possession of the power from on high. Already the phrase "I send the promise of my Father upon you" includes the idea of possession and power, as is evident from the ἐφ'ὑμᾶς, *i.e.*, the Holy Ghost will come over you; He is thought of as the power that will take possession of the Apostles. This idea of possession and power is brought out most forcibly in the following words: "But stay you . . . till you have entered under the power from on high." They are commanded to surrender themselves to the power that is coming to take possession of them: ἐφ'ὑμᾶς. If St. Luke had used "Him" instead of "power," the meaning would be the same; but by writing "power" he made the thought more emphatic. To explain this phrase further is superfluous. Suffice it to say that the δύναμις which we had to supply in the passages quoted from Greek literature, is here expressly mentioned. This then is an irrefragable proof for the correctness of our interpretation of the examples from the Greek literature. Here

[145] Lc. XXIV, 49.

the use of the middle is to be noted; it = to become the possession of; to surrender to the possession of.

b) In Pauline Writings

Paul uses ἐνδύνειν once in its literal sense. He speaks of evil men who enter into houses—*οἱ ἐνδύνοντες εἰς οἰκίας*,[146] "and lead captive silly women laden with sins." The ἐνδύνειν seems to imply that they entered with violence.

The middle ἐνδύεσθαι is employed by St. Paul metaphorically fourteen times.

a) Figurative Use of Ἐνδύεσθαι with an Impersonal Object

In four passages the term occurs in a figure taken from the armor of a soldier. He exhorts the soldiers of Christ to put on the armor of light—*ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός*,[147] the panoply of God—*ἐνδυσασθετὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ*,[148] and in particular the breastplate of justice—*ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης*,[149] and again the breastplate of faith and charity, and for a helmet the hope of salvation—*ἐνδυσάμενοι θώρακα πίστεως καὶ ἀγάπης, καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας*.[150] In these phrases in which the symbolic element is in the foreground, ἐνδύεσθαι implies possession. The only question is: Do the readers take possession of the various virtues or do the virtues take possession of the readers, so that the latter are regarded as passing under the possession and power of the virtues? In the light of our investigation, we must answer that, unless Paul has changed the sense of the middle ἐνδύεσθαι, the latter is the meaning. That Paul's use of ἐνδύεσθαι agrees with that of the profane literature and of the LXX, is apparent if we ask: Which is the transforming power and who is transformed? Evidently the virtues are the superior power, to which the readers should submit, and by which consequently they are transformed. The very comparison of these virtues with the arms of a soldier clearly indicates that Paul conceived them as powers, as means of resisting the snares and assaults of satan and as helps for doing good.

Likewise, the origin of these expressions may be of some interest. They strongly remind us of the Hebrew figures derived from the idea of garment. The phrase in Eph. VI, 14, *ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, may have been directly suggested by the

[146] 2 Tim. III, 6.
[147] Rom. XIII, 12.
[148] Eph. VI, 11.
[149] Eph. VI, 14.
[150] 1 Thess. V, 8.

LXX, for it is very similar to the expression found in Wisdom V, 19: *ἐνδύσεται θώρακα δικαιοσύνην*, and in Isaias LIX, 17: *ἐνεδύσατο δικαιοσύνην ὡς θώρακα*. But Paul goes further and speaks of passing under the possession also of the breastplate of faith and charity and in general of the arms of light and the panoply of God. Although it is probable that in the use of these phrases Paul had the LXX in mind, still we are not warranted to conclude with Cremer[151] from this one similarity that the O. T. origin of Paul's use of *ἐνδύεσθαί* in all cases is evident.

St. Paul, moreover, uses *ἐνδύεσθαι* with virtues as the object, without any reference to arms. In Col. III, 12, he exhorts the readers to put on the bowels of mercy, benignity, humility, modesty, patience—*Ἐνδύσασθε οὖν—σπλάγχνα οἰκτιρμοῦ, χρηστότητα, ταπεινοφροσύνην, πραύτητα, μακροθυμίαν*. Here again the symbolic element, especially in connection with the word *σπλάγχνα*, suggests the Hebrew origin of this phrase. The sense, at any rate, is clear: The Colossians should be possessed and transformed by these virtues.

A very striking example of the figurative use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* is found in 1 Cor. XV, 53-54. Explaining the manner of our resurrection, St. Paul says that on the last day "the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall rise again incorruptible. And we shall be changed" (v. 52). He then describes the change by which the risen shall be made incorruptible, by the figure of *ἐνδύεσθαι*. For, he says, "This corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality."—*δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν*. The contrasts in this example throw the clearest light on the meaning of *ἐνδύσασθαι*. The fundamental idea of property or possession and power is evident. But who is possessed? Clearly the *ἀφθαρσία* and the *ἀθανασία* are the stronger elements; they are the power that takes possession of the weaker elements, the *τὸ φθαρτόν* and the *τὸ θνητόν*, and change them. The sense then can only be: The corruptible and the mortal, *i.e.*, the body, are possessed and controlled by incorruptibility and immortality. In consequence of this possession, corruptibility and mortality cease to be, and incorruptibility and immortality take their place, so that the body which was corruptible and mortal (*τὸ φθαρτόν-τὸ θνητόν*), is now incorruptible and immortal. Note here again the use of the middle: *ἐνδύσασθαι*.

[151] *Bib.-theol. Wörterbuch d. neut. Gräc.*, 377.

It is also in this sense that Chrysostom explains the figure. He pictures this process as a clash between two powers. By St. Paul's phrase "this corruptible and this mortal," he says, the body is meant. Therefore, he concludes, the body remains, for it is the *τὸ ἐνδυόμενον*, one might say the object of possession and contention; but mortality and corruption are destroyed and vanish (*ἀφανίζεται*) when immortality and incorruption take possession of the body—*ἡ δὲ θνητότης καὶ ἡ φθορὰ ἀφανίζεται, ἀθανασίας καὶ ἀφθαρσίας ἐπιούσης αὐτῷ*.[152] In consequence of this possession, the body itself becomes immortal and incorruptible. Chrysostom continues: Therefore doubt no longer how it will live a life without end, when you hear that it is made incorruptible—*ὅτι ἄφθαρτον γίνεται*.[153]

St. Paul repeats his figure in verse 54: "And when this corruptible hath put on (*ἐνδύσηται*) incorruption and this mortal hath put on (*ἐνδύσηται*) immortality, then shall come to pass the saying that is written: Death is swallowed up in victory"—*κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νῖκος*. Here it is made still clearer which is the dominating power. Immortality gains the victory over mortality or death. The sense evidently is: the body passes under the dominion and power of incorruption and immortality. The expression *κατεπόθη*—is swallowed up, is consumed—shows us the powerful effect produced in the body by the possession of incorruption and immortality. The latter, not only overcome and expel mortality and corruption from the body, but utterly destroy them. As Chrysostom says, neither a remnant of it, *i.e.*, corruption, nor the hope of its return remains, for incorruption has destroyed corruption—*τῆς ἀφθαρσίας τὴν φθορὰν ἀναλωσάσης*.[154] In this example, we, therefore, have a most emphatic use of *ἐνδύεσθαι*, which suggests also the completeness, the totality of possession. A similar figurative use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* is found in 2 Cor. V, 2-4. In the first verse of this chapter, St. Paul says we know that, if this body is dissolved, we shall receive a glorified body, not made by hands, but eternal. Therefore, he continues in verse 2, "in this also we groan, desiring to be clothed upon (*ἐπενδύσασθαι*) with our habitation that is from heaven," *i.e.*, already in this body we desire to be possessed by the glorified body. This meaning is postulated by the middle form of the verb. The being possessed by the glorified body is curiously described by *ἐπενδύσασθαι*, which supposes the

[152] Migne, *P. G.*, 61, 365.
[153] *Ibid.*
[154] *Ibid.*

having become possessed by something else that has previously taken place by an ἐνδύεσθαι. The latter surrender to the possession of something else is explained in the next verse: εἴ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι οὐ γυμνοὶ εὑρεθησόμεθα. This verse has been a crux for exegetes and has received a great variety of interpretations.[155] But in the new light of our investigation of ἐνδύεσθαι, it can be satisfactorily solved. The ἐνδύεσθαι seems to refer to the possession *par excellence* of St. Paul, *i.e.*, the possession by the new life, the possession by Christ. The sense then is: Already in this body, although we have become the possession of Christ, we long to be possessed by the glorified bodies, *i.e.*, to be glorified. According to this interpretation, both the ἐνδύεσθαι and the ἐπενδύεσθαι belong to the supernatural order; the former transforms the soul, the latter the body; the ἐπενδύεσθαι is the natural completion of the ἐνδύεσθαι. The ἐνδύεσθαι may be regarded as a technical term which Paul used so frequently that his readers here knew what he meant without any explicit modification of the term. One who was baptized, then, was simply an ἐνδυσάμενος. This will become clearer when we come to the other passages where Paul speaks of the ἐνδύεσθαι *par excellence*.

β) Figurative Use of Ἐνδύεσθαι with a Personal Object

Apart from the two renowned passages in Gal. III, 27, and Rom. XIII, 14, St. Paul uses ἐνδύεσθαι with a personal object in the phrase "to put on the new man."

In Eph. IV, 22-24, he says the Ephesians have been taught "to put off, according to former conversation, the old man, who is corrupted according to the desire of error, and to be renewed in the spirit of their mind and to put on the new man, who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth"—καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας.

The phrase ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον is parallel with Libanius's expression ἐνέδυ τὸν σοφιστήν. But it is here more realistic. In both phrases, the object of ἐνδύεσθαι is designated by a generic noun which denotes, not a particular individual, but a class of persons. In both cases, moreover, possession is implied.

But who is the possessor, and who the possessed? The words of Libanius mean to give oneself up to the possession and power of sophism, and consequently to be changed according to the

[155] Cfr. Meyer, *2 Brief an d. Kor.*, 126. ff.

object, *i.e.*, to become a sophist. This meaning, as we have seen, is clear from the context in which the phrase occurs.

St. Paul's words likewise mean, as already the middle indicates, to give oneself up to the possession and power of the new man, to be possessed by the new man, *i.e.*, the new life, and consequently to be changed by and according to the object, *i.e.*, to become new men, to become men of the new life. As in the example from Libanius, the military life is replaced by the sophistic life, so here the old life is replaced by the new. The difference between the two examples is this: The new life to which Firminus gives himself up is merely an avocation; the new life, according to Paul, however, is not merely an avocation, a profession, but something that affects the very essence of the soul. The new man to whose possession we should surrender, is described by Paul as one "who according to God is created in justice and holiness of truth," *i.e.*, in true justice and holiness. Our new life then is a life of justice and holiness. By creating this new man, says Chrysostom, God created man a son; but this takes place in Baptism.—*Υἱὸν εὐθέως, φησὶν, αὐτὸν ἔκτισε· τοῦτο γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος γίνεται.*[156] In these words, Chrysostom describes the grand effect (*υἱὸν—ἔκτισε*) and the cause (*ἀπὸ τοῦ βαπτίσματος γίνεται*) of this *ἐνδύεσθαι*.

The figurative use of *ἐνδύεσθαι* in Col. III, 10, is very similar to its use in Eph. IV, 24; and it must be explained in the same way. In an exhortation to the Colossians, Paul says: "But now put you also all away: anger, indignation, malice, blasphemy, filthy speech out of your mouth; lie not one to another: stripping yourselves of the old man with his deeds, and putting on the new, who is renewed unto knowledge, according to the image of him who created him"—*ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν.*

In this passage, Paul distinguishes between the "old man" and "his deeds." By the "old man," therefore, the principle of the old life or simply the old life, must be meant; and by the "new man," the new life. Paul tells us that we should free ourselves of the possession and power of the old life and surrender ourselves to the possession of the new life. Note that already the *ἐνδύεσθαι* implies the *ἐκδύεσθαι*; the new life, when it takes possession of us, frees us from the dominion of the old; it replaces,

[156] Migne, *P. G.*, 62, 96.

destroys the old. But Paul emphasizes the utter destruction of the old life by expressly mentioning first the ἐκδύεσθαι.

The use of ἐνδύεσθαι with a personal subject and object in the phrase to be possessed by the new man, has no parallel in the O. T. But it has a perfect parallel in Greek literature, in the words of Libanius; and it bears a great similarity to the examples taken from Dionysius Hal. and Eusebius. True, also in the O. T. ἐνδύεσθαι-לבשׁ occurs with a personal subject and object and denotes possession; but, as we have seen, these examples differ from those found in Hellenic literature, in the κοινή period, and also in St. Paul. For in the former examples, the subject takes possession of the personal object; while in the latter, the subject enters into, gives himself up to the possession and dominion of the object. In the former, the active ἐνδύειν is used; in the latter, the middle ἐνδύεσθαι. This shows that Paul derived the use of ἐνδύεσθαι with a personal object, not from the O. T., but from the Hellenic literature.

The other two instances in which Paul uses ἐνδύεσθαι are the famous passages in Gal. III, 27, and Rom. XIII, 14. We shall take these up in our next chapter.

Our investigation of the other passages in the N. T., especially in Paul, where the expression occurs, has yielded the same results as to the meaning of the word as we derived from the study of the term in the profane Greek literature and, in its main and essential idea, also in the LXX. But Paul goes further than even the Hellenists inasmuch as he strongly emphasizes the fact that the power to which we surrender ourselves wholly replaces and utterly destroys its contrary power.

CHAPTER IV

APPLICATION OF THE RESULTS TO ROM. XIII, 14, AND GAL. III, 27

Before applying the results of this investigation to the Pauline formula, we shall restate them in a summary way. In the first chapter we reviewed the various interpretations of the formula by exegetes in the Middle Ages and in modern times. Owing to the utter confusion concerning the meaning of our phrase, we had recourse to the greatest authority on exegesis in the early Greek Church, St. John Chrysostom. The study of Chrysostom yielded the following results:

1. ΕΝΔΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΝ =

a) to surrender oneself to the possession and dominion of Christ, to become His property and possession.

b) Christ exercises His power over us out of love by

α) uniting us to Himself most intimately, so that we actually possess Christ or He actually dwells in us, and

β) conforming us to Himself.

The precise nature of this conformity must be determined by the context or circumstances in which the ἐνδύεσθαι is used. Therefore, in Rom. XIII, 14, the ἐνδύεσθαι regards the conformity to Christ's virtues; in Gal. III, 27, it regards the conformity to Christ's nature.

2. The ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν is to be taken, not figuratively, but literally: we actually become Christ's property and possession, and consequently Christ really dwells in us and conforms us to Himself. In this reality consists the "horrendum mysterium," of which Chrysostom speaks.

3. The grand historical fact by which we first become the property and possession of Christ is Baptism.

4. His interpretation of the Pauline formula Chrysostom confirmed by the popular proverb ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο and thus pointed to the Greek usage of the term ἐνδύεσθαι as the source of the

ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν and of his explanation of it, thereby giving us a touchstone wherewith to test the merits of his interpretation and to establish beyond all doubt the meaning of the formula.

The investigation of the meaning of (ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι in the Hellenic literature resulted in a powerful confirmation of Chrysostom's interpretation:

1. The first and fundamental idea connected with (ἐν)δύειν-(ἐν)δύεσθαι from its first use in Homer to its use in the κοινή period, is that of possession and dominion.

2. When used in its naive material sense, the term = to move from one place to another; either the subject that moves is a power or the place to which it moves is a place of domination.

3. In its more developed literal sense, as in its figurative meaning, the term expresses:

a) Possession and dominion, which implies

b) Union, and effects

c) Conformity of the possessed to the possessor. The precise nature of this conformity is determined by the context or the circumstances.

4. a) The active (ἐν)δύειν, except the II aorist, generally = to take possession and control of.

b) The middle (ἐν)δύεσθαι always = to surrender to the possession and control of, to become the property of and to be dominated by.

c) The II aorist active may have either meaning; the context must decide the meaning in each case.

5. In the phrase of Dionysius of Hal. τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι,[1] we have a strict parallel to the Pauline formula, current already before Paul wrote. It means to surrender to the possession and power of Tarquin; to become his property and to be controlled by him.

The result is further confirmed by the use of ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι in the LXX and the N. T., especially in St. Paul's writings. Here again the fundamental idea connected with the term is possession and dominion, which implies a union, and effects a conformity of the possessed to the possessor. In the Biblical literature, however, the II aorist active is not used, and the active always = to take possession and control of; the middle always = to surrender to the possession of, to come under the dominion and power of, to become the property of.

[1] *Ant. Rom.* XI, V, 2.

In the light of these overwhelming proofs there can be no doubt about the meaning of the Pauline formula in Rom. XIII, 14, and Gal. III, 27. There is no possibility of explaining it in any other sense than that which the term uniformly has in Hellenic literature, profane as well as sacred. Both the usage of St. Paul, as we have seen, and the context of the phrase, as we have noted in Chrysostom's explanation and as we shall see presently, not only favor this interpretation, but demand it.

The Pauline formula *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*, then, undoubtedly means to surrender to the possession and power of Christ, to give ourselves up to His power and dominion, so that we become His property and possession and He dominates us. In the parallel to Paul's formula, which we found in Dionysius of Hal. the phrase *τὸν Ταρκύνιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνδυόμενοι* means to give oneself up to the possession of Tarquin, to become his property, and to be controlled by him; but this is a figurative expression: the decemvirs are merely conceived as being the property and as being controlled by Tarquin. But the words of Paul *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* are not to be taken figuratively, but literally; they express a dread reality, a "horrendum mysterium."

This, then, is, in brief, the fundamental meaning of *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν*: to surrender ourselves to the actual possession of Christ, so that we become actually His property and are actually controlled by His power; consequently, Christ really dwells in us and actually conforms us to Himself.

The great historical fact by which the *ἐνδύεσθαι* is first effected is our Baptism into Christ as St. Paul says: *ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε.*[2] In Baptism we commit ourselves, our whole being, to Christ; we surrender ourselves to His possession and power; we become His property and possession, which He is to rule and dominate.

Christ, the Son of God, exercises this power by uniting us most intimately to Himself, so that He actually and personally dwells in us, and by conforming us to Himself. This conformity consists in our participation of His *μορφή*, His nature, our elevation to the dignity of sons of God. This is not mere figurative language; it expresses a dread reality, a "horrendum mysterium."

But the *ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν* is to be perfected by our lives. Therefore, Paul exhorts the Romans, who have been already baptized: *Ἐνδύσασθε τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.* We should, by our deeds,

[2] Gal. III, 27.

practically renew our surrender to Christ's possession and seek to do His will, whose property and possession we have become by Baptism. If we do this, then, as Chrysostom explains, Christ, moved by His love for us, will unite us yet more closely to Himself (which expresses again a dread reality, a "horrendum mysterium") and will effect in us a conformity to His virtues. In Baptism, we became other Christs by receiving His μορφή; in leading good lives, we become other Christs by assimilating His virtues. In the one case, we become sons of God by our nature; in the other, we become sons of God, as Chrysostom says elsewhere,[3] by our works.

In conclusion, we may remark that, since the phrase ἐνδύεσθαί τινα was current in the Greek literature before St. Paul wrote, all the opinions of commentators who would see in the Pauline formula an allusion to some fact or custom, whether Christian, Jewish, or pagan in origin, are unfounded.

COROLLARY

Confirmation of the Results by the Meaning of the N. T. Formula βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ

Ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν, as we have seen, means to become the property and possession of Christ and to be controlled by His power; the ἐνδύεσθαι is first effected in Baptism.

This result receives confirmation from the investigation of another N. T. formula: βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ. Heitmüller, in his excellent study *Im Namen Jesu*, with the aid of the inscriptions and monuments (ostraca and papyri) representing the conversational and business language of the Hellenic world, has proved beyond all doubt that in general the formula εἰς ὄνομά τινος expresses the "Zueignung an eine Person, die Herstellung des Verhältnisses der Zugehörigheit[4] unter Gebrauch des Namens der betr. Person."[5] In explanation of one of his examples he says that the name is mentioned and "indem der Name genannt wird, ist die mystische Verbindung mit der betr. Person vollzogen."[6]

Βαπτίζ. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ means: "taufen unter den Namen Christi, Christo zu eigen, in die Zugehörigkeit zu Chr. hinein."[7] In his summary, he gives the difference between the expression βαπτίζ.

[3] Cfr. Migne, *P. G.*, 60, 594.
[4] *"Im Namen Jesu,"* 109.
[5] *Ibid.*, 108.
[6] *Ibid.*
[7] *Ibid.*, 116.

ἐν and ἐπὶ τ. ὀνόματι and βαπτίζ. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα. The first two, he says, describe the manner in which Baptism takes place; "sie besagen, dass das Taufen sich vollzieht unter Nennung des Namens Jesu." The formula βαπτίζ. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, however, "giebt einen (den) Zweck und einen (den) Erfolg des Taufens an: es besagt, dass der Täufling in das Verhältnis der Zugehörigkeit, des Eigentums zu Jesus tritt." But, he adds, the last formula contains also "das Moment der Namennennung.[8]

It is remarkable that, as our investigation shows, the two important N. T. formulas ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν (which is effected by Baptism) and βαπτίζεσθαι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ both mean: to become by Baptism the property and possession of Christ and to be controlled by His power. Here, then, in the work of Heitmüller, we have a powerful confirmation and an excellent test of the correctness of our interpretation of the ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν.

[8] *Ibid.*, 127.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, Lyman, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans,* New York and Chicago, 1888.

Abbott, T. K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians,* New York, 1905.

Agus, Josephus, S. J., *Epistola Beati Pauli Apostoli ad Romanos,* Ratisbonae et Neo Eboraci, 1888.

Alber, Johannes Nep., *Interpretatio Sacrae Scripturae per omnes Veteres et Novi Testamenti Libros,* Tom. 14 et 15, Pesthini, 1804.

Alting, Jacobi, *Operum,* Tom. 4, Amstelaedami, 1686.

Bardenhewer, Otto, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* Vol. 3, Freiburg, 1912.

Bardenhewer, Otto, *Patrology, The Lives and Works of the Fathers of the Church,* Translated from the Second Edition by Thomas J. Shahan, Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, Mo., 1908.

Barnes, Albert, *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistle to the Romans*[10], New York, 1871.

Barnes, Albert, *Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Galatians*[2], New York, 1872.

Baxter, Richard, *A Paraphrase of the New Testament*[3], London, 1701.

Beelen, Joannis Theodori, *Commentarius in Epistolam S. Pauli ad Romanos,* Lovanii, 1854.

Beet, Joseph Agar, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* New York, 1891.

Belsham, Thomas, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle,* Vols. 1 and 3, London, 1822.

Bengel, John Albert, *Gnomon of the New Testament,* A New Translation by Charlton T. Lewis, and Marvin R. Vincent, Philadelphia, 1861.

Benseler, Gustav Eduard, *Griechisch-deutsches Schul-Wörterbuch,* Ed. Adolph Kaegi[10], Leipzig, 1896.

Bernardini a Piconio, *Epistolarum B. Pauli Apostoli Triplex Expositio,* Parisiis, 1857.

Beyschlag, Willibald, *New Testament Theology,* Translated by Neil Buchanan, Vol. 2[2], Edinburgh, 1899.

Bingham, Joseph, *The Works of,* Edited by His Lineal Descendant R. Bingham, Jun., Vol. 4[2], Oxford, 1855.

Binney, Amos, *The People's Commentary,* Including Brief Notes on the New Testament with an Introduction by Daniel Steele, New York, 1878.

Blass, Friederich, *Grammar of the New Testament Greek,* Translated by Henry St. John Thackary, London, 1898.

Bloomfield, S. T., *Recensio synoptica Annotationis Sacrae,* Being a Critical Digest of Annotations on the New Testament, Vols. 6 and 7, London, 1828.

Bocharti, Samuelis, *Opera Omnia,* Ed. Joannis Leusden et Petri a Villemandy, Vol. 1[3], Lugduni Batavorum, 1692.

Boise, James Robinson, *Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Greek Text of Paul's Epistles,* Edited by Nathan E. Wood, New York, 1896.

Borger, Elias Annes, *Specimen Hermeneuticum Inaugurale exhibens Interpretationem Epistolae Pauli ad Galatas,* Lugduni Batavorum, 1807.

Bosanquet, Edwin, *A Verbal Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* London, 1840.

Bousset, Wilhelm, *Der Brief an die Galater*[2], Göttingen, 1908. *(Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments,* herausgegeben von Johannes Weiss.)

Brenii, Danielis, *Opera Theologica,* Amstelaedami, 1666.

Brown, Francis, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament,* etc., Based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as Translated by Edward Robinson, Oxford, 1906.

Brown, John, *Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans,* New York, 1857.

Brunonis, Sancti, Carthusianorum, *Opera omnia,* Ed. Theodori Petrei, Coloniae, 1711.

Burkitt, William, *Expository Notes with Practical Observations on the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,* London, 1716.

Calmet, Augustini, O. S. B., *Commentarius Literalis in Omnes Libros Novi Testamenti,* Ed. Joannes Dominicus Mansi, Vol. 3, Wirceburgi, 1788.

Calvin, John, *Commentaries on the Epistles of Paul to the Galatians and Ephesians,* Translated from the Original Latin by William Pringle, Edinburgh, 1854.

Calvin, John, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans,* Translated and Edited by John Owen, Edinburgh, 1849.

Clemen, Carl, *Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources,* Translated by Robert G. Nisbet, Edinburgh, 1912.

Clemen, Carl, *Die Entwicklung der christlichen Religion innerhalb des Neuen Testamentes,* Leipzig, 1908.

Clemen, Carl, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testamentes,* Giessen, 1909.

Cook, F. C., *The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version* (A. D. 1611) *with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary,* etc., Vol. 3, *Romans to Philemon,* New York, 1886.

Cornelii a Lapide, S. J., *Commentaria in Scripturam Sacram accurate recognovit ac notis illustravit Augustinus Crampton,* Tom 18, *complectens expositionem litteralem et moralem Divi Pauli Epistolarum,* Parisiis, 1861.

Cornely, Rudolfus, S. J., *Commentarius in S. Pauli Apostoli Epistolas. Epistolae ad Corinthios altera et ad Galatas,* Parisiis, 1892. *(Cursus Scripturae Sacrae.)*

Cremer, Hermann, *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität*[9], Gotha, 1902.

Crocii, Joannis, *Commentarius in Omnes Epistolas Pauli Minores tribus tomis distinctus,* edidit per filium Joannem Georgium Crocium, Marpurgi, 1663.

Cumont, Franz, *The Oriental in Roman Paganism,* Translated by Grant Showerman, Chicago, 1911.

Cursi, Carlo M., *Il Nuovo Testamento,* Vol. 3, Roma, 1880.

Damm, Christian Tobias, *Novum Lexicon Graecum,* Reedited by John M. Duncan, Vol. 1, London, 1833.

Deissmann, Adolf, *Paulus,* Tübingen, 1911.

Delitzsch, Franz, *A System of Biblical Psychology,* Translated from the German by Robert Ernest Wallis[2], Edinburgh, 1890.

Denney, James, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* London, 1901.

De Wette, W. M. L., *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*[4], Leipzig, 1847.

De Wette, W. M. L., *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Galater und der Briefe an die Thessalonicher*[2], Leipzig, 1845.

Deylingii, Salomonis, *Observationum Sacrarum Pars Tertia* Lipsiae, 1715.

Dieterich, Albrecht, *Eine Mithrasliturgie,* Leipzig, 1903.

Doddridge, Philip, *The Family Expositor* or a Paraphrase and Version of the New Testament with Critical Notes, Vols. 4 and 5, London, 1756.

Dölger, Franz Joseph, ΙΧΘΥΣ, *Das altchristliche Fischsymbol in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung. (Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte,* Rom, 1909.)

D'Outrein, Johannis, *Spicilegium, De Induitione Christi ad Loca Rom.* XIII, 14 et *Gal.* III, 27. In: *Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica, Classis Quartae, Fasciculus Secundus,* Bremae, 1720.

Drummelow, J. R., *A Commentary on the Holy Bible by Various Writers,* Edited by, New York, 1909.

Drummond, James, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, and Philippians,* New York and London, 1903. *(International Handbooks to the New Testament,* Edited by Orello Cone.)

Du-Hamel, J. B., *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis cum selectis annotationibus*[2], Matriti, 1740.

Ellicott, Charles J., *A Commentary, Critical and Grammatical, on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* Introductory Notes by Calvin E. Stone, Boston, 1860.

Ellicott, Charles J., *A New Testament Commentary for English Readers,* London, 1884.

Estii, Guilielmi, *In Omnes Pauli Epistolas, item in Catholicas, Commentarii,* Ed. Franc. Sausen, Moguntiae, 1843.

Farrar, F. W., *The Life and Work of Saint Paul,* London and New York, 1879.

Feine, Paul, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*[2], Leipzig, 1912.

Findlay, G. G., *The Epistle to the Galatians*[6], London, 1900. (The Expositor's Bible.)

Ford, D. B., *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* Philadelphia, 1889. *(American Commentary on the New Testament,* Edited by Alvah Hovey.)

Fritzsche, Car. Frid. Aug., *Pauli ad Romanos Epistola,* Tom. 2, Halis Saxonum, 1839.

Gatakeri, Thomae, *Opera Critica,* Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1698.

Gazlay, Sayrs, *Comments on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures,* Cincinnati, 1870.

Gesenius, Gulielmus, *Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti,* Vol. 2, Leipzig, 1839.

Gesenius, Gulielmus, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, etc.,* Ed. Frants Buhl[13], Leipzig, 1899.

Godbey, W. B., *Commentary on the New Testament,* Vol. V, *Acts-Romans;* Vol. IV, *Corinthians-Galatians,* Cincinnati, 1899.

Godet, F., *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* Translated from the French by A. Cusin; Translation Revised and Edited by Talbot W. Chambers, New York, 1889.

Gray, James Comper, *The Biblical Museum:* A Collection of Notes, etc., Revised by George M. Adams. *The New Testament,* Vol. 2, *Containing the Epistles and the Revelation,* New York, 1897.

Grotii, Hugonis, *Operum Theologicorum, Tomus Tertius continens Annotationes in Epistolas Apostolicas et Apocalypsim,* Basileae, 1732.

Gunkel, Hermann, *Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verständnis des Neuen Testaments*[2], Göttigen, 1910.

Guyse, John, *The Practical Expositor or an Exposition of the New Testament,* Vol. 3, *Containing the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul's Epistle to the Romans*[3], Edinburgh, 1775. Vol. 4, *Containing Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians*[3], Edinburgh, 1775.

Hammond, H., *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament,* London, 1702.

Hasaei, Theodori, *De Baptizatis Christum indutis ad illustrationem loci Gal.* III, 27, *Exercitatio. In: Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica, Classis Quartae, Fasciculus Sextus* (cfr. D'Outrein), Bremae, 1721.

Heideggeri, Joh. Henrici, *Opus analyticum,* Vol. 2, Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1720.

Heitmüller, Wilhelm, *"Im Namen Jesu". Eine sprach-und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Neuem Testament, speciell zur altchristlichen Taufe,* Göttingen, 1903.

Henry, Matthew, *An Exposition of the Old and New Testament,* Vol. 9, *Romans to Revelation,* London, 1866.

Hofmann, J. Chr. K. v., *Die Heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments. Dritter Theil: Der Brief Pauli an die Römer,* Nördlingen, 1868.

Holden, George, *The Christian Expositor,* Vol. 2, *New Testament,* London, (no date).

Holsten, C., *Das Evangelium des Paulus,* Berlin, 1880.

Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*[2], Ed. A. Jülicher und W. Bauer, Tübingen, 1911.

Hovey, Alvah, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians,* Philadelphia, 1890. *(American Commentary on the New Testament.)*

Jacobs, Henry E., *Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and I Corinthians,* Chaps. I-VI, New York, 1896.

Jacobs, Henry E., Spieker, George F., Swenson, Carl A., *Annotations on the Epistles of Paul to I Corinthians VII-XVI, II Corinthians, and Galatians,* New York, 1897.

Jamieson, R., Fausset, A. R., and Brown, D., *A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments,* Vol. 2, *New Testament: Matthew-Romans,* Hartford, 1877.

Jeremias, Alfred, *Babylonisches im Neuem Testament,* Leipzig, 1905.

Joannis Chrysostomi, S., *Opera omnia,* Ed. J. P. Minge, Parisiis, 1862.

Jülicher, Adolph, *Der Brief an die Römer,* Göttingen, 1908.

Juncker, Alfred, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus,* Halle a. S., 1904.

Kypke, Georgii Davidis, *Observationes Sacrae in Novi Foederis Libros ex Auctoribus Potissimum Graecis et Antiquitatibus,* Tom. 2, *Acta Apostolorum, Epistolas et Apocalypsim Complexus,* Wratislaviae, 1755.

Lake, Kirsopp, *The Earlier Epistles of Saint Paul, Their Motive and Origin*[2], London, 1914.

Lambert, John C., *The Sacraments of the New Testament,* Edinburgh, 1913.

Lewin, Thomas, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul,* London, 1890.

Liddell, Henry George, and Scott, Robert, *A Greek-English Lexicon*[8], New York, 1897.

Lightfoot, Joannis, *Opera Omnia,* Vols. 1 et 2, Roterodami, 1686.

Lightfoot, J. B., *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* London, 1910.

Lightfoot, J. B., *The Apostolic Fathers,* Edited and Completed by J. R. Harmer, London, 1912.

Lipsius, R. A., *Briefe an die Galater, Römer, Philipper,* Freiburg i. B., 1891.

Luthardt, Chr. Ernst, *Der Brief Pauli an die Römer,* Nördlingen, 1887.

Luther, Martin, *A Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* Ed. S. S. Schmucker, Philadelphia, 1872.

MacEvilly, John, *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul and of the Catholic Epistles,* Vols. 1 and 2, Dublin, 1898.

Macknight, James, *A New Literal Translation from the Original Greek of all the Apostolic Epistles with a Commentary and Notes,* Vols. 1 and 2, London, 1816.

Melanthonis, Philippi, *Opera Quae Supersunt Omnia,* edidit Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider, Vol. 15, *Enarratio Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos,* Halis Saxonum, 1848.

Menge-Güthling, *Griechisch-deutsches und deutsch-griechisches Wörterbuch: Teil I. Griechisch-deutsch*[2], von Hermann Menge, Berlin-Schönberg, 1913.

Menochii, Joannis Stephani, *Commentarii Totius Sacrae Scripturae,* etc., Tom. 2, Venetiis, 1722.

Meyer, Heinr. Aug. Wilh., *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer*[4], Göttingen, 1865.

Meyer, Heinr. Aug. Wilh., *Kritsch-exegetisches Handbuch über den zweiten Brief an die Korinther,* Göttingen, 1870.

Millii, Joannis, *Novum Testamentum Graecum,* Ed. Ludolphus Kusterus, Leipsig, 1746.

Minge, J. P., *Scripturae Sacrae Cursus Completus,* Vol. 24, Parisiis, 1862.

Moule, H. C. G., *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans,* Cambridge, 1894.

Musculi, Dusani Wolfgangi, *In Epistolam D. Apostoli Pauli ad Romanos Commentarii,* Basileae, 1555.

Musculi, Dusani Wolfgangi, *In Epistolas Apostoli Pauli ad Galatas et Ephesios Commentarii,* Basileae, 1569.

Nägeli, Theodor, *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus,* Basel, 1904.

Natalis, Alexander, *Commentarius in Omnes Epistolas Sancti Pauli Apostoli et in VII Epistolas Catholicas,* Tom. 1, Parisiis, 1768.

Olshausen, Hermann, *Biblical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Thessalonians,* Translated from the German by a Clergyman of the Church of England, Edinburgh, 1856.

Olshausen, Hermann, *Biblical Commentary on the New Testament: Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans,* Translated from the German by a Clergyman of the Church of England[2], Edinburgh, 1856.

Paige, Lucius R., *A Commentary on the New Testament,* Vol. 4, *Epistle to the Romans,* Boston, 1857.

Paige, Lucius R., *A Commentary on the New Testament,* Vol. 6, *From the Epistle to the Galatians to the Epistle of Jude,* Boston, 1870.

Parker, Joseph, *The People's Bible,* Vol. 24, *Romans-Galatians,* London, 1898.

Pape, W., *Handwörterbuch der Griechischen Sprache*[2], Braunschweig, 1871.

Pfleiderer, Otto, *Der Paulinismus: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Urchristlichen Theologie,* Leipzig, 1890.

Pfleiderer, Otto, *Primitive Christianity,* Translated by W. Montgomery, and Edited by W. D. Morrison, Vol. 1, New York, 1906; Vol. 4, New York, 1911.

Philippi, Friedrich Adolph, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* Translated from the Third Improved and Enlarged Edition by J. S. Banks, Vol. 2, Edinburgh, 1879.

Philonis, Judaei, *Opera Quae Reperiri Potuerunt Omnia,* etc., Ed. Thomas Mangey, London, 1742.

Piscatoris, Joh., *Commentarii in Omnes Libros Novi Testamenti*[3], Herbornae Nasoviorum, 1637.

Platts, John, *A New Self-Interpreting Testament,* Vol. 3, London, 1827.

Poli, Matthaei, *Synopsis Criticorum Aliorumque Scripturae Interpretum,* Vol. 4, Londini, 1676.

Pool, Matthew, *Annotations upon the Holy Bible,* Vol. 3, New York, 1853.

Preuschen, Erwin, *Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur,* Giessen, 1910.

Pulpit Commentary, The, Edited by H. D. M. Spence and Joseph S. Exell, New York (no date).

Ramsay, W. M., *A Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians,* New York, 1900.

Ramsay, W. M., *St. Paul, the Traveller and the Roman Citizen,* New York, 1896.

Reitzenstein, R., *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, ihre Grundgedanken und Wirkungen,* Leipzig und Berlin, 1910.

Rendall, Frederic, *The Epistle to the Galatians,* Vol. 2², London, 1903.

Rickaby, Joseph, S. J., *Notes on St. Paul: Corinthians, Galatians, Romans²,* London, 1905.

Robinson, Thomas, *A Suggestive Commentary of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* Vol. 2, New York, 1873.

Rosenmülleri, Jo. Georgii, *Scholia in Novum Testamentum,* Tom. 3, Norimbergae, 1829; Tom. 4, Norimbergae, 1830.

Sanday, William, and Headlam, Arthur C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* New York, 1906.

Schaefer, Aloys, *Erklärung der zwei Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Galater,* Münster i. W., 1890.

Schaefer, Aloys, *Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer,* Münster i. W., 1891.

Schaff, Philip, *A Popular Commentary on the New Testament,* Vol. 3, *The Epistles of St. Paul,* Edinburgh, 1882.

Schilling, D., *Commentarius Exegetico-Philologicus in Hebraismos Novi Testamenti,* Mechliniae, 1886.

Schlatter, D. A., *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Zweiter Teil: Die Lehre der Apostel,* Stuttgart, 1910.

Schleusner, Joh. Fried., *Novum Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum,* Vol. 1, London, 1829.

Schleusner, Joh. Fried., *Novus Thesaurus Philologico-Criticus sive Lexicon in LXX et Reliquos Interpretes ac Scriptores Apocryphos Veteris Testamenti,* etc., Lipsiae, 1820.

Schmidt, Paul Wilhelm, and Holzendorff, Franz von, *A Short Protestant Commentary on the Books of the New Testament,* Translated from the Third Edition of the German by Francis Henry Jones, Vol. 2, London, 1883.

Schmoller, Otto, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians,* Translated from the German by C. C. Starbuck, with Additions by M. B. Riddle, New York, 1887. (Lange-Schaff, *Commentary on Holy Scripture.*)

Schoettgenii, Christiani, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae in Universum Novum Testamentum,* etc., Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1743.

Schumacher, Heinrich, *Christus in seiner Präexistenz und Kenose, nach Phil. 2, 5-8,* Rom., 1920.

Schweitzer, Albert, *Paul and His Interpreters, A Critical History,* Translated by W. Montgomery, London, 1912.

Shedd, William G. T., *A Critical and Doctrinal Commentary on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans,* New York, 1893.

Shook, William R., *A Brief Commentary and Lexicon on the New Testament,* Chicago, 1911.

Sieffert-Meyer, *Der Brief an die Galater⁹,* Göttingen, 1899. (Meyer, *Kommentar über das Neue Testament.*)

Simar, Hub. Theophil., *Die Theologie des heiligen Paulus,* Freiburg im Breisgau, 1883.

Steinmann, Alphons, *Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und Galater übersetzt und erklärt,* Bonn, 1918.

Stephani, Henr., *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Annotationes in Quibus Ratio Interpretationis Reddatur,* 1550.

Stevens, George Barker, *The Theology of the New Testament,* New York, 1905.

Stock, Christian, *Clavis Linguae Sanctae Novi Testamenti,* Ed. John Fred. Fischer, Leipzig, 1752.

Stuart, Moses, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans,* Edited and Revised by R. D. C. Robbins, Boston, 1859.

Teeter, Lewis W., *The New Testament Commentary,* Vol. 2, Mount Morris, Illinois, 1894.

Thayer, Joseph Henry, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament,* Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, Translated, Revised and Enlarged[4], Edinburgh, 1908.

Thomae, D. Aquinatis, O. P., *In Omnes D. Pauli Apostoli Epistolas Doctissima Commentaria,* Venetiis, 1562.

Tholuck, Fred. Aug. Gottreu, *Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans,* Translated from the Original German by Robert Menzies, Philadelphia, 1884.

Tirini, Jacobi, S. J., *In Universam S. Scripturam Commentarius,* Vols. 4 et 5, Taurini, 1884.

Tittmann, John Aug. Henry, *Remarks on the Synonyms of the New Testament,* Vol. 2, Edinburgh, 1837.

Trollope, M. A., *Analecta Theologica: A Critical, Philological, and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament,* Vol. 2[2], London, 1842.

Turner, Samuel H., *Notes on the Epistle to the Romans,* New York, 1824.

Ursini, Johannis Henrici, *Analectorum Sacrorum Libri Sex,* Vol. 1[2], Francofurti et Marburgi, 1668.

Usteri, Leonhard, *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater,* Zürich, 1833.

Vaughan, C. J., *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans with Notes,* London, 1893.

Vincent, Marvin R., *Word Studies in the New Testament,* Vol. 4, New York, 1900.

Vorstii, Conradi, *Commentarius in Omnes Epistolas Apostolicas,* Harderwici, 1631.

Vorstii, Johannis, *De Hebrismis Novi Testamenti Commentarius sive Philologia Sacra qua tum Theologica tum Philologica accedit ejusdem de Adagiis N. T. Diatriba,* Francofurti et Lipsiae, 1705.

Wahl, Christ. Abraham, *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica,* Leipzig, 1829.

Weiss, Bernhard, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament,* Translated from the Third Revised Edition by David Eaton, Edinburgh, 1892.

Weiss, Bernhard, *Die paulinischen Briefe und der Hebräerbrief,* Leipzig, 1902.

Weiss, Bernhard, *Der Brief an die Römer*[9], Göttingen, 1899. (Meyer, *Kommentar über das Neue Testament.*)

Weiss, Johannes, *Das Urchristentum,* Göttingen, 1914.

Wernle, Paul, *Die Anfänge unserer Religion*[2], Tübingen und Leipzig, 1904.

Wesley, John, *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*[4], New York, 1818.

Wetstenii, Joannis Jacobi, *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editionis Receptae cum Lectionibus Variantibus Codicum, MSS.*, etc., *necnon Commentario Pleniore, etc.*, Tom. 2, *Continens Epistolas Pauli, Acta Apostolorum, Epistolas Canonicas et Apocalypsim*, Amstelaedami, 1752.

Whedon, D. D., *Commentary on the New Testament*, Vol. 3, *Acts-Romans*, New York, 1871; Vol. 4, *I Corinthians-II Timothy*, New York, 1875.

Wieseler, Karl, *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Galater*, Göttingen, 1859.

Wolf, Jo. Christophorus, *Curae Philologicae et Criticae in X Posteriores S. Pauli Epistolas*, Vol. 2, Hamburg, 1738.

Wrede, W., *Paul*, Translated by Edward Lummis, London, 1907.

Zahn, Theodor, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*[2], Leipzig, 1910.

Zahn, Theodor, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Galater*, Leipzig, 1905.

Zeller, Eduard, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*[4], Leipzig, 1889.

Zöckler, Otto, *Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und der Galaterbrief*, Nördlingen, 1887.

Universitas Catholica Americae

Washingtonii, D. C.

S. Facultas Theologica, 1920-1921

No. 17

THESES

DEUS LUX MEA

THESES

QUAS

AD DOCTORATUM

IN

SACRA THEOLOGIA

Apud Universitatem Catholicam Americae

CONSEQUENDUM

PUBLICE PROPUGNABIT

LEO J. OHLEYER, O. F. M.

PROVINCIAE SSmi CORDIS JESU

S. THEOL. LICENTIATUS

THESES

I

The fundamental idea expressed by ἐνδύειν-ἐνδύεσθαι in the N. T. formula ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν is possession and dominion.

II

The active ἐνδύειν, except at times in the II aorist, as the historico-literary investigation of the term shows, means to take possession of.

III

The middle ἐνδύεσθαι, as the same historico-literary study reveals, always means to give oneself up to the possession and dominion of.

IV

The exegesis of St. John Chrysostom shows that the formula "induere Christum" is to be taken, not in a metaphorical, but in a literal sense.

V

The contention of Bloomfield, that the popular proverb ὁ δεῖνα τὸν δεῖνα ἐνεδύσατο is "scarcely apposite" to illustrate the meaning of the Pauline formula, can not be maintained in the light of the investigation of ἐνδύεσθαι in the Hellenic literature.

VI

The currency of the phrase ἐνδύεσθαί τινα in Greek literature is sufficient proof that St. Paul's words ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν contain no allusion to any custom or fact, whether Christian, Jewish, or pagan in origin.

VII

The similarity of the ἐνδύεσθαι Χριστόν, as used by St. Paul in Rom. XIII, 14, with the phrase of Seneca "indue magni viri animum," does not prove a dependence of one on the other.

VIII

Modern commentators in their manifold theories have completely lost sight of the fundamental idea contained in the formula "induere Christum."

IX

The arguments for the three years duration of the public ministry of Christ outweigh those advanced in favor of the one year or two years duration.

X

The similarities between the IV Gospel and the writings of Philo do not prove a dependence of St. John on Philo.

XI

John, *the Presbyter,* who is mentioned by Papias, is most probably identical with John, *the Apostle.*

XII

The theory of Chwolson gives the most satisfactory explanation of the date of the Last Supper.

XIII

The explanation of Pfleiderer and Wellhausen, according to which XXI, 1-19 of St. John's Gospel is identical with Luke V, 1-11 and merely symbolical, is untenable.

XIV

The evidence to the contrary is not sufficient to invalidate the testimony of St. Irenaeus concerning St. John's sojourn in Ephesus.

XV

The ingenious explanation of the Apocalypse by Marosow is refuted by the historical testimonies that prove the existence of the Apocalypse already in the second century.

XVI

St. Paul accepted the word *συνείδησις* from the Hellenic world but gave it a deeper meaning.

XVII

As an explanation of the "stimulus carnis" (II Cor. XII, 7) that afflicted St. Paul, both the theory of persecution and that of carnal temptation must be rejected.

XVIII

The conversion of St. Paul can not be explained as the mere result of a natural psychological development, but must be regarded as a miracle.

XIX

The discovery of the date of the reign of Aretas IV, ruler of Damascus, definitely fixes the date of St. Paul's conversion between 34 and 37 A. D.

XX

The speech of St. Paul on the Areopagus is not, as Norden claims, a forgery consisting in an imitation of a set type of speech used by missionaries in the first and second centuries A. D.

XXI

A careful study of the character and contents of the Pentateuch reveals a uniform plan in its composition so that it must be considered a literary unit.

XXII

The so-called double narratives in Genesis contain no contradictions, nor are they sufficient to disprove the unity of the authorship of this book.

XXIII

The arguments amassed by critics to impugn the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch are not of sufficient weight to justify the statement that these books have not Moses for their author but have been compiled from sources for the most part posterior to the time of Moses.

XXIV

The contention that some passages of the Pentateuch show a later than a Mosaic origin may be admitted and explained by the fact that the Pentateuch was a living law-book for the Jewish people and thus was perhaps open to occasional modifications in minor points.

XXV

In the chronology contained in the III and IV Book of Kings and the II Book of Paralipomenon, the fraction of a year which marks the beginning of a reign, and that which marks the end thereof, are recorded each as a chronological unit along with the full year-unit of a reign.

XXVI

In these Sacred Books the years of the kingdom of Juda are computed according to the sacred year, whereas the years of the kingdom of Israel are computed according to the civil year.

XXVII

For the correct understanding of the chronology of the kings of Juda and of Israel we must accept an interregnum, as the Sacred Text implies, between Zambri and Amri of Israel and between Achaz and Ezechias of Juda.

XXVIII

For a harmonious chronology of the times of the kings of Juda and of Israel it is essential to accept a coreign of Joram with Josaphat in Juda and of Achab with Amri in Israel.

XXIX

The coreigns of the kings of Juda and of Israel are entered in the Sacred Text chronologically, and are cross-checked on the contemporary rival reign, doubly: once at the year of accession of a king as coruler, a second time at the year of accession as sole ruler.

XXX

The view of some critics that the discourses of Eliu, Job XXXI, 1-XXXVII, 24 are a later interpolation is untenable from the linguistic as well as from the contextual standpoint.

XXXI

Regula fidei protestantica neque tuta, neque universalis aut ad controversias dirimendas apta dici potest.

XXXII

Regula fidei catholica est tuta, omnibus obvia, et ad lites componendas plane sufficiens.

XXXIII

Sola in Ecclesia Romana plene inveniri potest nota apostolicitatis.

XXXIV

Ecclesiam suam ita instituit Christus ut semper primatu Petri tamquam visibili centro auctoritatis et unitatis polleret.

XXXV

Testis praeclarus est Sanctus Paulus veritatis resurrectionis ex mortuis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.

XXXVI

Progressus dogmatum non in eo consistit ut eis sensus tribuendus sit alius ab eo quem intellexit Ecclesia, sed in eo quod uberior et clarior praebeatur eorumdem explicatio.

XXXVII

Secundum Concilium Vaticanum "existentia Dei per ea quae facta sunt, naturali rationis humanae lumine certo cognosci potest", et secundum

juramentum praescriptum contra Modernistarum errores, "etiam demonstrari potest".

XXXVIII

Christus nos redemit non tantum doctrina et exemplis, sed specialiter morte sua piaculari.

XXXIX

Humana Christi natura, quatenus hypostatice Verbo conjuncta, una et eadem adoratione cum eodem Verbo est colenda; quare etiam Cor Jesu cultu latreutico dignum est.

XL

Beata Maria virgo fuit ante partum, in partu et post partum.

XLI

Sacramenta Novae Lagis gratiam conferunt ex opere operato omnibus obicem non ponentibus, ideoque falsum est assertum Modernistarum Sacramenta eo tantum spectare, ut in mentem hominis revocent praesentiam Creatoris semper beneficam.

XLII

Ad validitatem Sacramentorum requiritur intentio vere interna faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, ac proinde non sufficit jocosa vel externa intentio.

XLIII

Validus est Baptismus sive per immersionem, sive per infusionem, sive per aspersionem collatus; sed propter rationes congruas in ecclesia Romana Baptismus per infusionem est conferendus.

XLIV

Communio sub utraque specie singulis fidelibus jure divino non est necessaria, ideoque Ecclesia potuit legitime calicis usum laicis interdicere, prout de facto propter rationes optimas interdixit.

XLV

"1. Qui a media nocte jejunium naturale non servaverit, nequit ad sanctissimam Eucharistiam admitti, nisi mortis urgeat periculum, aut necessitas impediendi irreverentiam in sacramentum.

"2. Infirmi tamen qui jam a mense decumbunt sine certa spe ut cito convalescant, de prudenti confessarii consilio sanctissimam Eucharistiam sumere possunt semel aut bis in hebdomada, etsi aliquam medicinam vel aliquid per modum potus antea sumpserint."—Can. 858.

XLVI

The inherent right of every human being to subsist from the earth's bounty implies the right of access thereto on reasonable grounds.

XLVII

The laborer has an inborn right to a living wage; this claim is valid, generally speaking, in his present occupation.

XLVIII

The employer's right to interest on his capital is morally inferior to the laborer's right to a living wage.

XLIX

Natural justice demands that the remuneration of every adult male laborer should be such as to maintain himself and his family in reasonable and frugal comfort.

L

Under existing conditions, interest-taking does not violate justice.

LI

Can. 13 et 14.

LII

Can. 91-95.

LIII

Can. 96 et 1076.

LIV

Can. 97 et 1077.

LV

Can. 1078.

LVI

St. John Chrysostom is rightly recognized as one of the most brilliant representatives of the historico-philological method of biblical interpretation, who at the same time does full justice to the hermeneutical principle of a mystico-typical sense in Holy Writ.

LVII

The exile of St. John Chrysostom, effected by the coalition of the Byzantine court with Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, is the tragedy of a fearless antagonist of the injustice practised by the State power and its allied forces.

LVIII

The religious aspect of the Reformation does not adequately explain its rapid spread in Germany.

LIX

Both by his doctrine and by his political activity, Luther increased the religious unrest of his day and hindered the progress of the true reform movement.

LX

The Knownothing party was not only a political party but primarily an anti-Catholic organization.

BIOGRAPHICAL

Leo Joseph Ohleyer was born July 31, 1891, in Indianapolis, Indiana. His primary studies he pursued at Sacred Heart Parochial School, of the same city. In 1905, he entered the Preparatory Seminary at Teutopolis, Ill. After completing his novitiate (1910-1911) in the Franciscan Order, he devoted two years more to the classical studies at Quincy, Ill. In the Franciscan Seminary at West Park, Ohio, he pursued the course in Philosophy (1913-1915) and in Theology (1915-1918), completing the latter course in St. Louis (1918-1919). In 1919, he matriculated at the Catholic University of America, where he received the S. T. B. and S. T. L. in 1920. He is specializing in Holy Scripture and Oriental Languages.

NOV 30 '33